1-1-1993

Mentoring and retention of physical therapy faculty.

Joanne Pelletier Rickert
University of Massachusetts Amherst

MENTORING AND RETENTION OF PHYSICAL THERAPY FACULTY

A Dissertation Presented

by

JOANNE PELLETIER RICKERT

Submitted to the Graduate School of the

University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

September 1993

School of Education

MENTORING AND RETENTION OF PHYSICAL THERAPY FACULTY

A Dissertation Presented

by

JOANNE PELLETIER RICKERT

Approved as to style and content by:

Johnstone Campbell, Chair

Helen Schneider, Member

Linda Kahn D'Angelo, Member

Bailey W. Jackson, Dean
School of Education

DEDICATION

To Larry, my partner in life. Thank you for your unconditional love, patience and encouragement which ultimately made this all possible. Your belief in me has enabled me to succeed beyond my dreams.

To our children Patrick and Mariel. Your humorous and joyful diversions were necessary for the sane completion of this dissertation. You have truly taught me the meaning of the word miracle.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is with great pleasure that appreciation is expressed to those individuals whose cooperative efforts have contributed to the quality of this dissertation as well as to the potential influence on the lives of faculty. This accomplishment is one to be shared with many.

To my chair Dr. Johnstone Campbell and my committee members Dr. Helen Schneider and Dr. Linda Kahn D'Angelo who graciously shared their time, patience and wisdom. Your wealth of knowledge has not only influenced this dissertation but my life.

To Anna May Stephany whose colorful comments brightened my dissertation and my days. Thanks to Steve Bedford for making the statistical analysis meaningful and practical. Acknowledgment and thanks are also extended to Dr. Lu Ann Ricketts Gaskill for allowing me to utilize portions of her questionnaire for this study.

To all of my mentors, I am eternally grateful. Most importantly, thanks to my husband Larry whose love and encouragement facilitated the completion of this doctoral degree. Through it all, I thank God for allowing my life to be blessed with such wonderful people, and for granting me the capability to see this through completion.

ABSTRACT

MENTORING AND RETENTION OF PHYSICAL THERAPY FACULTY

SEPTEMBER 1993

JOANNE PELLETIER RICKERT, B.S., UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

M.S., BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Johnstone Campbell

The factors influencing the retention of physical therapy college faculty had not been previously substantiated. In this study investigating faculty retention, all 36 full-time faculty from the four accredited, entry-level physical therapy programs in a large southern state, received a questionnaire. Twenty-eight (78%) returned the completed questionnaire. In addition, interviews were conducted with eight consenting faculty, two from each of the four universities.

Although mentors are considered by physical therapy faculty to be very valuable, mentorship alone did not significantly affect physical therapy faculty retention. In addition, no significant differences were noted between mentored and non-mentored faculty with regard to gender, rank, tenure, salary, career selection, prospects for future success, and job satisfaction. In addition, gender did not significantly influence retention, salary, tenure, rank, prospects for future success, career planning, feelings about job change or retention in present job.

In this study a slightly higher percentage of women versus men were mentored. The majority of women and all men had a mentor of the same gender. Unlike women in male dominated professions, women in physical therapy faculty positions found other women and men willing to act as their mentors. Women also tended to remain in the mentoring relationship for more years than men. Mentored faculty, particularly women, had also taken on the role of mentor, thus perpetuating the mentor relationship legacy. Both women and men experienced relatively few problems as compared with the many benefits of the mentor relationship.

There appeared to be a variety of factors influencing faculty retention. The questionnaire results revealed rank and tenure to influence faculty retention positively. Within the interviews, faculty most frequently mentioned other "faculty", as a positive feature attracting them to and retaining them within their institution. Salary, although not a significant finding in the survey, was mentioned several times throughout the interviews. It appeared that when salaries reach a critically low level, one lower than or approximating the salary of new graduates, faculty reconsider their options for clinical rather than academic jobs. The institution studied that had the highest retention also had the greatest percentage of tenured faculty and the second highest salary.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

Retention of faculty in physical therapy programs in the United States is a growing concern to many physical therapy professionals (APTA, 1989). At present, there is a shortage of physical therapy faculty, particularly doctorally prepared faculty, throughout the country (APTA 1983, 1985, 1987, 1989; Personic 1987).

Factors which may be adversely affecting retention include the following. The APTA (1983) faculty survey determined that faculty salaries were disproportionately low in comparison to that of physical therapists in the clinical setting. In addition, the demands for research, publications and presentations, inadequate time for clinical practice, inadequate research and teaching resources, and heavy work loads, were several areas of stress reported by physical therapists in academic settings (Reagan, 1986; Pearl, 1987).

In spite of all these hindrances and challenges there are faculty in physical therapy programs who choose to remain in academia. According to the APTA (1989) 307 faculty were on tenure track. Additionally, there are those who are promoted, excel and are satisfied within this environment.

Researchers have determined that mentors can have a profound influence on the development, promotion, success, and satisfaction of individuals whose lives they have influenced (Kram 1983, 1985; Levinson, 1978; Missirian 1980, 1982; Phillips-Jones 1982; Ricketts 1988). Several authors described factors which may influence retention in other settings.

Kram (1983, 1985) Kram and Isabella (1985) Levinson (1978) Missirian (1980, 1982) and Yoder (1985) ascribed that people who had a mentor move up the promotional ladder faster and higher, have increased satisfaction, increased retention, increased productivity, and increased likelihood of becoming a mentor to others. Kram and Isabella (1985) also explained that peer relationships are important in job satisfaction and career advancement.

In addition, Missirian (1980, 1982) attested that several individuals are successful because of their ability to utilize their own qualifications to their advantage, in-spite of the inequities in the system. Perhaps it is these individual differences which allow faculty to excel in the presence of numerous obstacles. The literature above describes the positive benefits of having a mentor, yet it also suggests that women have a more difficult time acquiring a mentor, particularly a female mentor. The previously cited studies involved women in male dominated fields. This research examined the role a mentor played in

the retention of men and women faculty in the female dominated profession of physical therapy, an area of research not previously investigated.

Given the review of the research on physical therapy faculty, it is obvious that there are factors other than the increase in the number of physical programs that are influencing the physical therapy faculty shortage. It is also apparent that merely graduating more physical therapists will not assure that more therapists will assume faculty positions thereafter. It is also clear that inspite of the significant hurdles of academe, there are faculty who select this environment over the traditional clinical setting and remain therein. Consequently, there are factors currently present which influence these faculty to remain in the academic environment.

Problem

The problem that this researcher addressed was that while there were faculty who were retained, the factors influencing this retention remained unsubstantiated. Based on an analysis of research in physical therapy, academia and mentor relationships, reasons for this lack of substantiation appeared to be that previous studies had examined mentors in light of promotion, job satisfaction, and career success (Missirian 1980, 1982; Kram 1983, 1985; Ricketts 1988). In addition, the studies on physical therapy and academe had primarily focused on attrition from

and attraction to academic settings (APTA 1983, 1985, 1987, 1989). These studies had neglected to examine the role a mentor may play in faculty retention.

Thus, it is apparent that a new approach to studying the retention of faculty in physical therapy programs is warranted. Mentor relationships, an area not previously investigated in this arena, seemed to be playing an important role in this retention.

Hypotheses

The primary hypothesis of this study was: Physical therapy faculty with a mentor will have greater retention (remain within that institution for greater years) than faculty without a mentor. The secondary hypothesis was: The role a mentor has on physical therapy faculty will vary with gender.

Purpose

The primary purpose of this study is to identify the role that a mentor has on faculty retention in physical therapy programs in Florida and to determine if this role varies with gender. For the purposes of this study, a mentor is considered to be an experienced person who aids with the professional development and career advancement by providing various career and psychosocial functions, beyond the typical supervisory guidance to a developing individual (protege) (Ricketts 1988).

Career functions previously determined to be the most beneficial include exposure and visibility, sponsoring, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments. Psychosocial functions include acceptance and confirmation, counseling and friendship, and role modeling (Kram 1985).

This study will define retention as the ability to keep faculty in the same academic physical therapy program in a large southern state for more than 2 years.

The objectives of this study were to examine:

1. Differences in the prevalence of mentoring relationships between faculty who are retained and those who are not retained.

2. The perceived importance of career mentoring relationships as a means of retention.

3. How characteristics of career mentoring relationships differ for female and male faculty as this relates to retention.

4. The differences and similarities between the questionnaire and the interview results.

5. Additional factors which may be influencing faculty retention (i.e. tenure, rank, salary, job satisfaction).

Significance

Researchers have determined that mentors can have a profound influence on the development, promotion, success, and satisfaction of individuals whose lives they have influenced (Kram 1983, 1985; Levinson, 1978; Missirian 1982;

Phillips-Jones 1982; Ricketts 1988). These investigators determined that the mentor relationships may be one of the most important relationships, for the emotional as well as the professional development of young adults.

Kram (1985) reported that the career functions of the the mentor included sponsorship or nomination, providing exposure, visibility, coaching or discussion strategies, protection, and enabling growth of proteges. She went on to describe additional psychosocial functions of the mentor that were provided to the protege. These included role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling and friendship.

The mentor also benefited from the mentoring relationship by receiving information, prestige, loyalty, and assistance by the protege. This may have, in turn, facilitated the career advancement of the mentor, as well as the protege. (Kram and Isabella 1985; Burke, 1984; Zey, 1984)

The importance of mentor relationships in the career and psychosocial development of women was noted in the earlier work of Hennig and Jardim (1977) and later reinforced by that of Missirian (1980), Kram (1985), Ricketts (1988).

In addition, Roche (1979) determined that individuals who were mentored were more satisfied with their careers when compared with non-mentored individuals. The work of

Ricketts (1988) revealed similar findings for female retail executives who were mentored.

It appears that mentor relationships for men and women had been studied primarily in the business arena. Very little was known about the role mentor relationships played within the physical therapy academic environment. The association between mentor relationships and faculty retention had not yet been explored.

Research investigating the prevalence, perceived importance and characteristics of mentoring relationships as this relates to faculty retention is important to academic administrators who strive to retain faculty. Previous studies had documented the high cost of recruitment, orientation and training of individuals in a new position; yet, little investigation concerning retention had been performed. Mentoring relationships may prove to play a vital and cost effective role in faculty retention. In addition, the added benefits of career advancement, job satisfaction, and friendship for faculty, could also have a positive effect on the students within this environment. This may further influence the preparation of students for the increasingly autonomous profession of physical therapy, which indirectly influences society at large.

This study is significant for several reasons. First, this research approaches the physical therapy faculty shortage problem from a different perspective than that of

the APTA. The focus of this research is on retention, a perspective that had been overlooked in the research on physical therapy. Although faculty have been retained, the reasons for their retention had not been explored. It appears that these reasons are vital to the understanding of faculty retention. Examining the role a mentor plays in the retention of faculty in physical therapy programs had never been studied.

Second, if a mentor plays a role in faculty retention, as was believed that it would, this research promised to lend a better understanding to the type and characteristics of a mentor which contribute most to faculty retention.

Third, this research sought to determine whether certain characteristics were gender preferred. The association between gender and retention, along with a variety of other characteristics was examined. This was performed in order to determine whether both genders are more similar in their reasons for retention than previously demonstrated in traditional research on retention in business. This is particularly important when one compares the male dominated profession of business with the female dominated profession of physical therapy.

Finally, a better understanding of the role of a mentor, tenure, rank, promotion and other characteristics may provide useful information to academic programs in physical therapy who are interested in retaining faculty.

Retention of faculty has a direct effect on the shortage of physical therapy faculty. In addition, these experienced individuals who have been retained may thereby serve as an attraction feature for other physical therapists who are exploring different avenues within the profession.

The conclusions drawn from this study on the effects of a mentor and other characteristics, on the retention of faculty will help to serve as a guideline for programs to retain faculty in physical therapy programs in academic settings. These conclusions may also serve as a guideline for future studies on retention in other settings. In addition, there may be generalizability of the results of this research to other similar programs.

Definition of Terms

Mentor is an experienced person who aids with the professional development and career advancement by providing various career and psychosocial functions, beyond the typical supervisory guidance to a developing individual (protege). (Ricketts 1988)

Retention is the ability to keep faculty in the same academic physical therapy program in Florida for 2 years or more. Two years had been selected because 53% of faculty surveyed by the APTA (1989) fall into the category of 1 to 7 years within each institution.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Retention of faculty in physical therapy programs in the United States is a growing concern to many physical therapy professionals (APTA 1989). Mentoring has been reported to be a factor which enhances an individual's career advancement, success, satisfaction and feeling of belonging to "the network" (Levinson 1978; Phillips Jones 1982; Missirian 1980; Kram 1983, 1985; Ricketts 1988).

The primary focus of this study is to determine whether mentors play a role in the retention of physical therapy faculty in Florida. Likewise, this study will examine whether this role varies with gender. In the pages that follow, a review will be presented of selected literature under the topical headings of the physical therapy faculty shortage, mentoring relationships and summary.

The Physical Therapy Faculty Shortage

At present there is a shortage of physical therapy faculty, particularly doctorally prepared faculty, throughout the country (APTA 1983, 1985, 1987, 1989; Personic 1987). Factors which may be adversely affecting retention include the following. The APTA (1983) faculty survey determined that faculty salaries were disproportionately low in comparison to that of physical therapists in the clinical setting. Similarly, the demands

for research, publications and presentations, inadequate time for clinical practice, inadequate research and teaching resources, and heavy work loads, were several areas of stress reported by physical therapists in academic settings (Reagan 1986; Pearl 1987).

In spite of all these hindrances and challenges there are faculty in physical therapy programs who choose to remain in academia. According to the APTA (1989) 307 faculty are on tenure track. Additionally, there are those who are promoted, excel and are satisfied within this environment.

Physical therapy is growing dramatically, particularly in autonomous positions (APTA 1984, 1987). The population at large is becoming more health conscious and seeking the services of physical therapists in order to achieve and maintain their optimal physical condition. The physical therapist's clients may range in age from 1 day of life to over 100 years of age.

The need for physical therapists is increasing at a rate higher than the present supply can meet. This has resulted in a greater market for physical therapists in the hospital, private office, and home care settings. Higher therapist's salaries and benefits have accompanied these changes (APTA 1983, 1986).

Physical therapists in 27 states in the United States are presently able to practice without a physician's

referral (Monahan, 1992). As this autonomous practice act takes hold throughout the United States, it may be more difficult to retain physical therapists in teaching positions where research requirements and tenure are substantial hurdles. The demands for research, publications and presentations, teaching resources, and heavy work loads, were several areas of stress reported by the physical therapists in academic settings (Reagan 1986; Pearl 1987). These factors are accompanied by disproportionately low salaries in comparison to those of therapists in the clinical setting.

In 1989 the APTA surveyed the 116 physical therapy programs in the United States. Six programs did not respond, the following data was derived from the 110 responding programs. The number of full-time faculty was 722, 464 (64%) were women. There were 204 part-time physical therapy faculty, 133 (65%) were women, 307 faculty were on a tenure track in associate professor or full professor positions, 89 were not eligible, and 105 were at schools that don't award tenure. The data of men and women in each of the ranks was as follows: 1 woman graduate assistant, 14 women and 7 men lecturers, 86 women and 27 men instructors, 225 women and 103 men assistant professors, 106 women and 91 men associate professors, 30 women and 26 men full professors (2 of the 718 faculty did not respond to this

question). At the time of this study, there were 105 vacant faculty positions.

The APTA (1986) study of faculty indicated that women comprised 67% of the faculty in academic year 1984-1985. In 1987, Dr. Rose Myers, chairperson of Education for the APTA, reported 70% to be the approximate percentage of women faculty for that year. In 1989, Dr. Marc Goldstein, chairperson of the Education for the APTA, confirmed that percentage had decreased to 64%. In addition, in 1989 women comprised only 54% of associate professors and 54% of full professors; yet, comprised 70% of all positions at the assistant professor rank or lower. These national statistics were similar to the data collected on the physical therapy programs in Florida.

In 1990 the directors of each of the four accredited physical therapy programs in Florida were contacted by this researcher. Each director reported on the status of the faculty. It was determined that women constituted 59% of the faculty, but only 50% of the faculty at the rank of associate professor or higher. There was only one full professor in all four programs at that time, she was a woman.

In this state, women represented 64% of the assistant professors or lecturers. Therefore, in Florida there was a 4% lower representation of women at the higher ranking positions and a 6% lower representation at the assistant

professor and lecturer positions, as compared with the national statistics. Perhaps the following may explain some of the reasons for these gender discrepancies.

There is a high percentage of women physical therapy faculty when compared to other fields and professions. The physical therapy profession, as a whole, has an even greater percentage of women. Women constitute 75% of the physical therapy profession and 64% of the faculty in physical therapy programs throughout the United States. The women physical therapy faculty face a "double jeopardy". As women faculty, they face discrimination, though apparently no worse than women faculty in other fields. These women physical therapists face adverse working conditions and lower economic rewards than private clinicians. In addition, the hurdles for advancement, recognition, salary and tenure are particularly high when compared with other women in private practice.

This would lead one to believe that faculty would leave the academic setting to join their colleagues in the clinical setting. According to the APTA (1989) 307 faculty were on tenure track, thus planning to remain in academia. Given the relatively low salary and high requirements of academe, one must examine other factors; which may be associated with the retention of these faculty. This researcher believes that mentoring plays an important role in faculty retention. Prior to this study, no one had

addressed the role that mentoring played in the decision of physical therapists to remain in faculty positions.

Mentoring Relationships

The word "mentor" has its origin in Greek mythology. In the tale of Odysseus, Odysseus entrusted his son, Telemachus, to his friend and advisor, Mentor. Mentor served as his son's guardian, teacher and father figure. Athena, goddess of wisdom and the arts, would disguise herself as Mentor and appear in his place.

Today, "mentors are influential people who significantly help you reach your major life goals. They have power through who or what they know, to promote your welfare, training and career" (Phillips-Jones, 1982) p.21. Levinson (1978) describes the mentor in a psychosocial sense; "The mentor takes the younger man [woman] under his [her] wing, invites him [her] into a new occupational world, shows him [her] around, imparts his [her] wisdom, cares, sponsors, criticizes and bestows his [her] blessing." This writer's definition of mentoring agrees with that of Levinson's, with one major exception, it includes women as evidenced by the bracketed inclusions.

Mentoring has long been recognized as a valuable means of developing specific attributes and potential in men. This relationship has been recognized as a key factor in their progress toward higher positions in corporations,

science and medicine (Becker and Strauss, 1956; Goffman, 1961; Levinson 1978).

Several authors have alluded to the importance of a mentor in the lives of women. However, the mentor/protege relationship was not the primary focus of their study (Epstein, 1970; Hennig and Jardin, 1971; Kanter, 1977). More recently, mentoring has been studied in the lives of women. This is particularly important when considering the APTA's 1991 report, that women presently constitute approximately 70% of the physical therapy population and 64% of physical therapy faculty.

Phillips-Jones (1980) studied 332 successful women in business and industrial settings. Mentoring was mentioned as one of the important strategies used by these women. Almost two thirds of these women claimed to have had at least one mentor. Several of the advantages of having a mentor included; advisement on career goals, encouragement, acquisition of new or improved skills or knowledge, having models to follow, increased exposure and visibility, as well as opportunities and resources. The mentor was also seen as a bridge to maturity.

Linda Phillips-Jones (1982) studied more than 500 mentor-protege relationships. She concluded that "finding and making use of the right mentors is the most critical step you'll ever take in your career" (p. 16). Within her book, she describes five developmental phases which take the

protege from admiration to transformation. Several of the potential problems in mentor-protege relationships are revealed. These include: excessive time and energy commitments, inappropriate choice of mentor or protege, unrealistic expectations, feelings of jealousy or inferiority, as well as a host of others.

Missirian (1983) studied women at the top of the corporate organizational hierarchy. These women worked their way to the highest-ranking woman-held, management positions in the company. Fifteen women were interviewed. Mentoring was determined to be a significant part of the career development of these women. From her results it was determined that each of these women had at least one mentor, and several had more than one. She explained that it was this mentor, who facilitated the junior member to "break into the 'in' group" (p. 2). The importance of being regarded as "in" and learning the communication etiquette of a specific position was emphasized in the work of several authors (Becker and Strauss, 1956; Goffman, 1961). This finding was also noted by Hall (1948) in his study of the medical profession. It was noted that these women also became mentors themselves. This completed the three developmental phases of the mentor-protege relationship described by Missirian; the initiation phase, the commitment phase, and the last phase, which involves the transition toward a "compeer" (comrade/peer) relationship.

Kram (1983) studied mentoring in 18 relationships, where women were the proteges. She established that a mentor relationship can significantly enhance development at various stages for both individuals involved, by facilitating work on tasks that are reflected in concerns about self, career, and family. She examined this with reference to the developmental stages of Erickson (1950). She described the young adult's being in a stage of initiation; the task of middle adulthood was one of reappraisal, and later adulthood involves redefinition, and reflection upon one's career.

Kram (1983, 1985) depicted the mentor relationship as having the potential to enhance career development and psychological development of both individuals. She described specific career functions as sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and allowing one to accept the responsibilities of challenging experiences. The psychosocial functions include role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship.

Ricketts (1988) examined career mentoring relationships of 243 female retail executives in the Southwestern region of the United States. She determined that women who were mentored received significantly more promotions, were more likely to be an upper level executive and were more satisfied with their jobs. Ricketts controlled for years in retail career positions, however, she did not examine the

role mentoring played in the retention of these female executives. The association of mentoring with retention had not been previously investigated.

Yoder (1985) noted that individuals with mentors earned greater money and were happier in their progress than those who had not been mentored. What was also noted is that many individuals were not willing to accept the responsibility of being a mentor because they felt they had enough to contend with, given their own struggle for acceptance. Yoder also noted that women will act as mentors when the situation encourages such behavior. Hence, it is essential that this "situation" be present if women are to be accorded the same privileges as men. In Kram's 1983 study there were equal numbers of women and men in junior managerial positions. However, there was only one female mentor who was in a relationship with one female junior member. All other women in junior positions had men mentors. The question of accessibility to women mentors in this situation was not addressed. Perhaps this is an illustration of the point made by Yoder (1985) regarding tokenism.

As material on tokenism suggests, women are at a distinct disadvantage. Kanter (1977) describes tokens as marginal, underrepresented members of a work group. Yoder (1985) reported that women, in traditionally male positions, may be perceived as tokens. In addition to the stress mentioned previously, these individuals may be discouraged

from sponsoring other women due to situational pressures, thus, perpetuating the low number of women promoted (Yoder, Adams, Grove, and Priest, 1985).

In academia women are a minority. Women are less likely to be tenured. They are infrequently found in higher positions of authority. Women are more frequently found in lower ranks of the faculty strata. Women are more profoundly effected by negative stereotypes than their male counterparts.

Each of these factors places women at a distinct disadvantage, as they interact on committees and in other roles of their faculty and administrative position. These stresses and tokenism may drain women, so as to limit their accessibility as a mentor to junior faculty members. As noted by Missirian and Kram, this lack of a mentor places these women at a further disadvantage.

Kanter (1977) indicated that until more women are in managerial positions, the tokens will have difficulty eliminating dysfunctional collusion in stereotypical roles. Kram (1985) described the need for society to support equality and collaboration between the sexes in a genuine and effective way.

It is interesting to observe that all of these studies involve the mentoring of women in male dominated professions. Physical therapy, being a female dominated profession, may present different results and insight.

There may be limitations when one reaches beyond the female dominated departmental level, and addresses higher levels, which are once again male dominated. It should be recognized that although there is a majority of women in physical therapy academic programs (APTA 1989); these women are not a majority in the higher ranking positions; nor are they a majority when one compares these faculty and administrators with all other departments combined in the academic setting (Ahern, 1981; APTA, 1985; Astin Bayer, 1973; Etaugh, 1984; US Census Bureau 1988). These results were also acknowledged when this researcher examined the ranking of physical therapy faculty in this large southern state in 1990. Hence, this researcher also proposed to examine the role mentoring had on retention in light of gender.

Summary

Researchers have determined that mentors can have a profound influence on the development, promotion, success, and satisfaction of individuals, whose lives they have influenced (Kram 1983, 1985; Levinson, 1978; Missirian 1983; Phillips-Jones 1980-1982; Ricketts 1988). Several authors described factors, which may influence retention in other settings. Kram (1983, 1985) Kram and Isabella (1985), Levinson (1978), Missirian (1980, 1982) and Yoder (1985) asserted that people who have a mentor move up the promotional ladder faster and higher, have increased satisfac-

tion, increased retention, increased productivity, and increased likelihood of becoming a mentor to others.

Kram and Isabella (1985) also described that peer relationships are important in job satisfaction and career advancement. In addition, Missirian (1980, 1982) maintained that several individuals are successful because of their ability to utilize their own qualifications to their advantage, in-spite of the inequities in the system. Perhaps, it is these individual differences which allowed faculty to excel in the presence of numerous obstacles.

The literature above depicted the positive benefits of having a mentor; yet, it also suggested that women have a more difficult time acquiring a mentor, particularly a female mentor. The previously cited studies involved women in male dominated fields, this research examined the role a mentor plays in the retention of men and women faculty in the female dominated profession of physical therapy, an area of research not previously investigated.

Therefore, the problem that this research addressed was that while there are faculty who are retained, the factors influencing this retention remained unsubstantiated. Based on an analysis of research in physical therapy, academia and mentors; reasons for this lack of substantiation appears to be that previous studies had examined mentors in light of promotion, job satisfaction, and career success. Furthermore, the studies on physical therapy and academe

have primarily focused on attrition from and attraction to academic settings. These studies have neglected to examine the role a mentor played in faculty retention.

Thus, it is apparent that a new approach to studying the retention of faculty in physical therapy programs is warranted. Mentor relationships, an area not previously investigated in this arena, seems to be playing an important role in this retention. A study designed to study the role that mentoring plays in the retention of physical therapy faculty is described in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Given the review of the research on physical therapy faculty, it is clear that there are factors other than the increase in the number of physical therapy programs that are influencing the physical therapy faculty shortage. It is apparent that merely graduating more physical therapists will not assure that more therapists will assume faculty positions thereafter. It is also evident, from the literature, that in spite of the significant hurdles of academe, there are faculty who select this environment over the traditional clinical setting and remain therein. Not withstanding, there are factors currently present, which influence these faculty to remain in the academic environment.

The first problem that this researcher addressed was that the factors positively influencing the retention of faculty remain unsubstantiated. Mentor relationships have been known to profoundly influence individuals in the business environment. It was believed by this researcher, that faculty who had a mentor were likely to be retained by institutions of higher education in physical therapy.

This research, on the role of a mentor on faculty retention in physical therapy, was exploratory in nature. A review of the literature, as stated, above established the

need for this investigation. This research proposed to identify the role that a mentor had on faculty retention in physical therapy programs in a large southern state and to determine if this role varied with gender.

Physical therapy faculty in the four accredited programs for entry level physical therapists in a large southern state were surveyed to determine whether mentors are associated with faculty retention in this state. Faculty attitudes were measured by the responses to portions of the previously established questionnaire developed by LuAnn Ricketts (1988) on mentoring. This population included 36 full-time faculty. The second portion of this questionnaire examined whether the association with mentors and retention varied with gender.

The second stage of this study involved a series of eight interviews, with randomly selected consenting participants, to determine whether there are factors influencing the role a mentor has on faculty retention, that cannot be communicated through this questionnaire. To determine this, an interview was conducted. The results of this interview are reported and compared with those of the questionnaire. The interview involved asking three open ended questions (Appendix E). The interview process noted in studies of Kram (1985) and Missirian (1983) served as a guideline for this interview process.

An in depth analysis of the role of a mentor, as it relates to retention, was performed in the institution which demonstrated the highest rate of retention. The data were analyzed and conclusions drawn from this analysis.

Hypotheses

The primary hypothesis of this study was: Physical therapy faculty with a mentor will have greater retention (remain within that institution for a greater number of years) than faculty without a mentor. The secondary hypothesis was: The role a mentor has in the retention of physical therapy faculty will vary with gender.

To organize the research to test these hypotheses, three questions were asked:

The first research question for this study was that a mentor affects the decision of physical therapy faculty to remain in physical therapy programs in higher educational institutions. The independent variable was mentored versus non-mentored faculty and the dependent variable was years of service. It was hypothesized that faculty with a mentor will be retained for a greater number of years, than faculty without a mentor. To assess this effect, portions of the previously established questionnaires of Ricketts (1988) were used.

The second research question was whether there was a difference between men and women who were mentored, or who

mentor, as evidenced by years retained in faculty positions and by responses provided in the same questionnaire.

The third research question was whether there were factors influencing the role a mentor had on the retention of men and women faculty, that cannot be communicated adequately through a questionnaire survey. To determine this, interviews were conducted and the results of these interview were compared with those from the questionnaire survey.

The above data were collected, analyzed and interpreted to evaluate the role a mentor had on the retention of men and women faculty in physical therapy programs in this large southern state.

Subjects

All of the 36 full-time physical therapy faculty in the four accredited programs for entry level physical therapists in a large southern state received this questionnaire of which 28 replied. A sample of 2 faculty members from each institution was selected for an interview to determine if factors, other than those present on the questionnaire, were influencing their retention and the mentor/protege status.

Instrumentation

Questionnaire

Questions from the statistically valid and reliable questionnaire of Ricketts (1988) was used for phase one of this study. A cover letter with this questionnaire was

distributed to every full-time faculty member of the four accredited programs in a large southern state. A follow-up letter with the same questionnaire were mailed to the individuals, who failed to respond to the first mailing within two weeks.

This mail survey, of all of the subjects selected, served as a data base for the analysis of the role; a mentor plays in retention of physical therapy faculty in academic programs. These factors were also examined in light of gender utilizing this questionnaire.

Interview

Phase two of this study involved an interview of two faculty from each of the four academic programs in a large southern state. These faculty were randomly selected from the list of respondents to the questionnaire, who agreed to this interview process. The names and numbers of affirmative respondents were placed into a pool from which two names from each institution were drawn randomly. The telephone interview included four open ended questions (Appendix E).

Procedure

A questionnaire was developed from the previously established and statistically valid and reliable survey by Ricketts (1988), (see Appendix D). Each of the subjects was mailed a copy of the cover letter (Appendix A) and the questionnaire. The director (or acting director) of each of

the institutions was contacted to confirm the receipt of the questionnaires. The purpose of this study and the importance of the responses were discussed with each director. Each director agreed to relay this information to their faculty. Two weeks later, a follow-up copy of the questionnaire was mailed along with a follow-up letter (Appendix B) emphasizing the importance of the response to individuals, who did not respond to the first questionnaire. Two weeks later, one last follow-up post card (Appendix C) was mailed as a reminder to non-respondents. The questionnaire had an identifying numerical code.

Phase two of this study involved an interview of two consenting faculty from each of the four academic programs in a large southern state. These faculty were randomly selected from the list of faculty members who responded to the questionnaire. The codes were matched to the telephone number of those individuals. Subsequently, the interviews were conducted and tape recorded. The telephone interviews included the following four open ended questions:

1. What attracted you to this position?
2. What support system have you encountered in this position?
3. What would you like that was not there? (i.e. support)
4. Is there anything else you would like to add?

This researcher interviewed two faculty from each of the four accredited institutions, in this large southern state, who consented to the interview and subject confidentiality was assured and maintained throughout.

The data were collected and analyzed. The role of a mentor in faculty retention was examined. In addition, an analysis of specific factors in light of gender was performed.

Data Analysis

This mail survey of all of the subjects selected served as a data base for the analysis of the role a mentor plays in retention of physical therapy faculty in academic programs. Statistical analysis primarily involved descriptive statistics, using central tendencies. Cross tabulations, multiple regression, chi square and t-tests were utilized, using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSX). However, the results from these tests were influenced by the small number in the sample. When a small sample is used in statistical analysis, a larger difference is necessary to demonstrate a significant difference. A larger sample would more readily reveal a significant difference.

These statistics were used to examine the association between the presence of a mentor versus the absence of a mentor (independent variable), and years retained (dependent variable). Furthermore, analysis was utilized to examine

whether the role a mentor played in retention varied between men and women faculty. The interviews were recorded and transcribed. The data obtained from the interviews was analyzed and frequency counts were made. The results of the interviews are presented and analyzed with respect to the responses and analysis of the questionnaire.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

In this study investigating faculty retention in physical therapy programs in a large southern state, 36 full-time physical therapy faculty in the four accredited entry level programs received this questionnaire. This population included the four directors of these programs. Two faculty members from each institution were selected for an interview to determine if factors, other than those present on the questionnaire, were influencing their retention and the mentor/protege status.

Questionnaire

Twenty eight (78%) of the thirty six faculty returned the completed questionnaire. Twenty questionnaires (56%) were returned after the first mailing, while eight additional questionnaires (22%) were returned after the second mailing. No additional questionnaires were returned after the mailing of the follow-up postcard. The following findings are based on the total (28) returned questionnaires.

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Table 1 (Sample Demographic Characteristics, p. 33) presents a profile of the characteristics for the total sample. Analysis of the data revealed that the participants were predominantly women, 18 women (64%) as

Table 1

Sample Demographic Characteristics

Characteristics	n	%
Gender		
Women	18	64
Men	10	36
Age Group		
35-40	11	40.7
41-45	8	29.6
46-50	3	11.1
51-55	3	11.1
56-60	1	3.7
61-65	1	3.7
Marital Status		
Single	5	17.9
Married	17	60.7
Separated	1	3.6
Divorced	4	14.3
Widowed	1	3.6
Children		
With Children	17	60.7
Without Children	11	39.3
Number of Children		
1	6	35.3
2	5	29.4
3	6	35.3
Race		
African American	4	14.8
Hispanic	1	3.7
Caucasian	21	77.7
Asian	0	0
Alaskan	0	0
Native American	0	0
Other	1	3.7

compared with 10 men (36%). This proportion is fairly representative of physical therapists and physical therapy faculty in the United States (APTA 1990, 1992). The participants ranged in age from 35 to 61, with a mean age of 43.7. Since one individual listed "3" in this category, this was considered to be an obvious, error and omitted from the data calculation. There were more faculty (11) between the ages of 35 to 40 than in any other age group. The second highest number of faculty (8), within one group, was noted to be between the ages of 41 to 45. Thus, 70% of faculty were between the ages of 35 to 45. All figures are rounded so total may vary slightly from 100%.

The majority of the participants were married (61%). Eighteen percent of the participants were single, 14% were divorced. There was one individual separated (3.57%) and one widowed individual (3.57%).

Sixty-one percent of the participants had children. Six had one child, five had two children, and six participants had three children. None of the participants had more than three children.

Caucasian faculty constituted three quarters of the respondents (75%). There were 4 African American faculty (14%), one Hispanic faculty and one faculty listed in the category of "other". One faculty member did not respond to this question.

In summary, the majority of respondents comprised white, married women with two children. The following is a description of the academic characteristics of these respondents.

Academic Characteristics of the Respondents

Table 2 (Academic Characteristics of Respondents, p. 36) illustrates the Academic Characteristics of the respondents. All faculty who responded were listed as full-time faculty (89%) or director/chairperson (11%). There was only one full Professor, a woman. The ranking which held the most faculty was the level of Associate Professor (39%) succeeded by Assistant Professor (36%). Twelve women faculty were at the assistant and associate level. This represents 42% of the total faculty and 66% of the total women faculty, as compared with 9 men faculty, representing 32% of the total faculty but 90% of men faculty. Five women were instructors (15% total faculty/ 28% total women faculty), as compared with one male instructor (4% of the total/ 10% total men faculty).

The number of years in a physical therapy faculty position ranged from 1 to 29 with a mean of 10.2. The number of years at "this institution" ranged from 1 to 29, with a mean of 8 years. There was a significant correlation (.89185) between the numbers of years at "this institution" and the number of years in a physical therapy faculty position ($p < .00001$).

Table 2

Academic Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristics	n	%
Full-time Faculty	25	89.3
Director/Chair	3	10.7
Years in Academe		
1-5	11	39.3
6-10	6	21.4
11-15	4	14.3
16-20	3	10.7
21-25	2	7.1
26-30	2	7.1
Years at "This Institution"		
1-5	13	46.4
6-10	9	32.1
11-15	3	10.7
16-20	1	3.6
21-25	0	0
26-30	2	7.1
Tenure		
Non-tenure	11	39.3
Tenure-Track	7	25.0
Tenure	10	35.7
Faculty Career Selection		
Preplanned	15	53.6
Accidental	13	46.6
When Selection Occurred		
High School	2	7.1
College	4	14.3
After entering labor market	17	60.7
Other	5	17.9

	Women		Men	
Rank				
Instructors	5	27.8	1	10
Assistant Professor	6	33.3	4	40
Associate Professor	6	33.3	5	50
Professor	1	05.6	0	0
Degree				
Baccalaureate	2	11.1	0	0
Master	7	38.9	3	30
Doctorate	9	50	7	70

Non-tenured faculty had a mean number of years in academe of 8 and 5.14 at "this institution", as compared with 15.65 and 14.25 respectively for tenured faculty. Tenure track faculty exhibited the lowest number of years in academe (5.79) as well as "this institution" (3.64).

A doctoral degree was the highest level of education with the greatest number of faculty (16). This represented 57% of the faculty, as compared with 36% at the masters degree level and 11% with baccalaureate degrees. Of the doctorally prepared faculty seven were men (3 assistant , 4 associate professors); as compared with nine women (4 assistant, 4 associate, 1 full professor). There were 10 master degreed faculty. Four of these were at the instructor level (3 women, 1 man); three were assistant professors (2 women, 1 man) and four were instructors (3 women, 1 man). There were only two faculty who possessed solely baccalaureate degrees, both were women instructors.

Thirty nine percent of the faculty were non-tenured. Of the remaining 61% of faculty, seven (25%) were on tenure track, and 10 (36%) were tenured.

Fifteen faculty (54%) stated their selection of a faculty career was preplanned, representing only slightly more than the 46% who affirmed their selection was accidental. The majority (61%) decided to enter academe after entering the labor market. Fourteen percent made this decision in college.

Most faculty (23 = 82%), regardless of gender, rank or retention, had a career history with a continuous employment pattern. Two-thirds (68%) of the faculty were employed within the three public institutions surveyed. Twenty faculty (71%) reported that they had not been promoted within the last five years.

Sixteen of the respondents (57%) established that this was not their only job. Yet, 25 faculty (89%) reported this to be their primary job. Only one faculty member reported that this was not the primary job (4%). Two individuals neglected to respond to this question. Fifteen faculty responded to "the nature of the other job". All of these responses indicated some type of clinical involvement. Six served as consultants; five worked in and/or owned a private practice; three worked in a clinic, and one individual was employed in a hospital.

Salaries were reported within ranges; therefore, the midpoints of those ranges were used to calculate the mean salaries. In addition, a category of >$75,000 was listed as the salary for one faculty. Thus, for the purposes of this study, "$75,000" was used as the figure for this category; when calculating the mean, since a specific amount was not listed. Consequently, the reporting of the mean salary is approximate.

The salaries ranged from $30,001 to > $75,000 (Table 3, Faculty Salaries, p.39). The mean salary was $47,411,

Table 3

Faculty Salaries

Characteristics	n		%	
Within "This Institution"	Women	Men	Women	Men
<30,000	0	0	0	0
30,000-35,000	2	1	11	10
35,001-40,000	2	2	11	20
40,001-45,000	4	1	22	10
45,001-50,000	3	4	17	40
50,001-55,000	4	1	22	10
55,001-60,000	1	0	6	0
60,001-65,000	0	0	0	0
65,001-70,000	1	0	6	0
70,001-75,000	0	1	0	10
>75,000	1	0	6	0
	18	10	101	100
$\bar{x}$	47,917	46,500		

$\bar{x}$ for all men and women faculty= 47,411

Outside of "This Institution"				
None	7	2	39	20
<5000	6	3	33	30
5,001-10,000	2	0	11	0
10,001-15,000	0	1	0	10
15,001-20,000	3	0	17	0
20,001-25,000	0	1	0	10
25,001-35,000	0	0	0	0
35,001-40,000	0	1	0	10
40,001-45,000	0	0	0	0
45,001-50,000	0	1	0	10
50,001-75,000	0	0	0	0
>75,000	0	1	0	10
	18	10	100	100
$\bar{x}$	8,864	26,250		

$\bar{x}$ for all men and women faculty= 16,184

*percentages have been rounded

the mode was $47,500. The mean faculty salary (1991-1992) reported by the American Physical Therapy Association was reported to be $45,739, a $1,672 difference from that noted in the study of this large southern state. In conclusion, there was not a significant difference in salary between men and women faculty. The mean women's salary, however, was slightly higher than men's salaries $47,917 and $46,500, respectively. These figures on salary as related to gender, vary from those acquired by the APTA (1984, 1985) and Goldberg (1990). This previous research noted significantly lower salaries for women as compared with men in academe, and in physical therapy as a whole. One factor which may have influenced these results includes the failure of the male administrator to return the questionnaire. Administrative faculty have been reported by the American Physical Therapy Association to earn the highest average salaries. This may have influenced the slightly lower mean salary noted for men faculty in this study. Salaries, alone, were not found to be significantly associated with greater retention in academe or within "this institution", when chi square analysis was performed.

Nine faculty reported earning no salary outside the academic institution. Of the remaining 19 faculty the salaries were calculated as indicated above. The salaries ranged from less than $5,000 (calculated as $5,000) to greater than $75,000. Nine faculty reported earning less

than $5000. The mean salary outside the academic institution was $16,184.

In summary, the average, full-time, doctorally prepared faculty ranked at the assistant or associate professor level and was not tenured. Although this faculty position was the primary job, it was not the only job held by this faculty. The average salary was $47,411 within "this" institution and $16,184 from outside sources. Faculty preplanned their careers in academe and had a history of a continuous employment pattern. The average faculty was in a faculty position for 10.2 years and spent 8 years within "this" institution. Faculty salary, alone, did not influence retention.

Mentored Versus Non-mentored Faculty

Two tailed t-tests were used to analyze data that were numerical and chi square analysis was used to test data that were categorical in nature. Tables 4 and 5 (Mentoring and Retention, p. 42 and Mentored and Non-Mentored Faculty, p. 43) detail information on mentored and non-mentored faculty.

Eighteen (64%), of the faculty surveyed, stated that they had "been guided by a more experienced, higher ranking individual, who aided their professional development and career advancement, beyond normal supervisory guidance". Twelve (67%) of these were women, and six (33%) were men. It is interesting that 67% of all women respondents reported being mentored as compared with 60% of men, a roughly

Table 4

Mentoring and Retention

Characteristics	Mentored		Non-mentored	
	n	%	n	%
Women	12	67	6	33
Men	6	60	4	40
total	18	64	10	36

	Women		Men		Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Faculty Retention in Academe								
<2 years	0	0	1	20	0	0	0	0
2-5	5	42	1	20	3	50	1	20
6-10	1	8	1	20	2	33	2	40
11-15	3	25	1	20	0	0	0	0
16-20	1	8	1	20	0	0	1	20
>20	2	17	0	0	1	17	1	20
total	12	100	5	100	6	100	5	100

$\bar{x}$ of all faculty= 10.2, $\bar{x}$ of mentored faculty= 10.5, $\bar{x}$ of non-mentored faculty= 10.0

Faculty retention at this Institution

	Women		Men		Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<2 years	2	17	0	0	1	17	0	0
2-5	4	33	2	40	3	50	1	20
6-10	3	25	2	40	2	33	2	40
11-15	1	8	1	20	0	0	1	20
16-20	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20
>20	2	17	0	0	0	0	0	0
total	12	100	5	100	6	100	5	100

$\bar{x}$ of all faculty= 8.1, $\bar{x}$ of mentored faculty= 8.3, $\bar{x}$ of non-mentored faculty= 7.5

	Women		Men		Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Instructor	3	25.0	1	17	2	33.3	0	0
Assistant Professor	4	33.3	2	33	2	33.3	2	50
Associate Professor	4	33.3	3	50	2	33.3	2	50
Professor	1	8.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
total	12	99.9	6	100	6	99.9	4	100

Table 5

Mentored and Non-Mentored Faculty

		Professor and Associate		Assistant Professor		Instructor	
		M	N	M	N	M	N
Years in Academe							
	1-05	0	0	5	3	2	1
	6-10	3	2	0	0	0	1
	11-15	2	0	0	0	2	0
	16-20	1	0	1	1	0	0
	21-25	0	2	0	0	0	0
	26-30	2	0	0	0	0	0
Years at "This Institution"							
	1-05	0	0	5	3	3	2
	6-10	6	3	0	0	0	0
	11-15	0	0	1	1	1	0
	16-20	0	1	0	0	0	0
	21-25	0	0	0	0	0	0
	26-30	2	0	0	0	0	0
Career Selection Method							
	Preplanned	4	1	5	2	2	1
	Accidental	4	3	1	1	2	1
Timing Career							
	High School	1	0	0	0	0	1
	College	2	0	2	0	0	0
	Labor Market	2	3	3	3	4	1
	Other	3	1	1	0	0	0
Employment Pattern							
	Continuous	7	3	6	3	3	1
	Interrupted	1	1	0	0	1	1
Promotions in Last 5 Years							
	0	6	1	5	4	4	2
	1	2	3	0	0	0	0
	2	0	0	1	0	0	0
Prospect for Future Advancement							
	Fairly Good	0	0	1	0	0	0
	Very Good	4	2	3	3	1	2
	Excellent	4	2	2	1	3	0

equivalent percentage. Much of the literature describes men, particularly those in higher rank, as being more likely than their female colleagues to acquire a mentor. This literature describes predominantly male dominated professions as compared with the female dominated profession of physical therapy. Of the non-mentored faculty, six (60%) were women and four (40%) were men.

The primary hypothesis of this study was: Physical therapy faculty with a mentor will have greater retention (remain within that institution for greater years), than faculty without a mentor. The mean number of years in academe for mentored faulty was 10.5, as compared with 10 years for non-mentored faculty. This difference was not significant. The mean number of years at "this institution" for mentored faculty was 8.3, as compared with 7.5 for their non-mentored counterparts. This difference of less than one year was also not significant.

The secondary hypothesis was: The role a mentor has on physical therapy faculty retention will vary with gender. Once again, this was not found to be significant.

Individuals who were mentored earned a mean salary of $48,056 as compared with $42,500 for their non-mentored counterparts. This difference of $5,556 was not found to be statistically significant when a two tailed t-test was performed.

Twice as many of the faculty in the professor/associate professor (8) and instructor category (4) were mentored. Assistant professors (3) were 30% more likely to be mentored. The largest portion of mentored professors and associate professors (3) was retained in academia for six to ten years.

In comparison, there was an even split for non-mentored professors and associate professors, with the majority falling within the two ranges of six to ten years (2) and twenty-one to twenty-five years (2). At the assistant professor level, both mentored (5) and non-mentored (3) faculty fell within the range of one to five years (2). Mentored instructors explicably fell within two ranges, one to five years, and eleven to fifteen years; as compared with non-mentored instructors occurring within the range of one to ten years. When examining years at "this institution", the majority of professors and associate professors was found in the six to ten year range both for mentored (6) and non-mentored faculty (3). At the assistant level and instructor level, both were at "this institution" for one to five years. No significant differences in rank were deduced between mentored and non-mentored faculty.

The majority of faculty (n=16/57%), whether mentored or not, made their decision, to enter academe, after entering the labor market. Mentored professors and associate professors (3) were found predominantly in the "other"

category, claiming graduate school specifically. In addition, the two non-mentored instructors were found to make their decision in high school or after entering the labor market. The majority of faculty, regardless of rank or mentoring, had continuous employment patterns. No significant differences between mentored faculty and non-mentored faculty were found when examining career decisions and employment patterns.

Overall, the majority of faculty (71%), regardless of rank and mentoring status, had not received a promotion within the last five years. Three non-mentored associate professors were promoted one time within five years, as compared with two mentored professors and associate professors. Only one faculty, a mentored assistant professor, was promoted twice within five years.

The majority of faculty (96%), regardless of rank or mentorship, rated their prospects for future advancement to be "very good" to "excellent". Only one mentored assistant professor rated prospects as "fairly good". Overall, 50% of mentored faculty rated their prospects as "excellent", as compared with only 30% of non-mentored faculty. There was no significant difference in prospects for future success between mentored and non-mentored faculty. The lack of statistical significance in this finding is probably influenced by the small sample size in this study.

Fifty percent of mentored faculty, as compared with only 20% of non-mentored faculty implied they would change their jobs. Faculty at the highest ranked levels were more likely to change jobs (11% of the total faculty); two were non-mentored and one was mentored. This decision to change jobs was not found to be significant when mentorship and rank were examined (See Table 6, Job Change by Mentorship, and Rank p. 48).

When asked if they were likely to leave, two faculty (7%), both mentored, were very likely to leave within the next year. Seven faculty (25%) would consider leaving within the next two years or less, if given a better offer. Four faculty (14%) were unlikely to leave within two years and eight faculty (29%) were unlikely to leave within five years. Seven faculty (25%), four mentored and three non-mentored, are planning to stay until retirement. No significant difference was noted in decision to remain in the present job, when mentorship and rank were analyzed.

Sixty-one percent of faculty with a mentor had preplanned their careers, as compared with forty percent of non-mentored faculty. Mentored faculty, in higher (4) and lower (4) ranks, were equally divided between preplanned and accidental selection of academe; while middle ranked faculty (5) were predominantly in the preplanned category. The majority of higher ranked non-mentored faculty (5) accidentally selected a faculty career, with greater non-

Table 6

Job Satisfaction by Mentorship and Rank

Feelings about job change

	Prof/Assoc Prof		Assist Prof		Instructor	
	M	N	M	N	M	N
Quit immediately if I could find another job	0	0	0	0	0	0
Accept another with comparable salary	1	1	0	0	0	0
Change job and occupation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maintain a job in academe in another institution	0	1	0	0	0	0
Not eager but would change for better job	3	1	1	1	2	0
Cannot think of any job for which I'd exchange mine	0	1	1	1	1	2
Would not exchange my job for any other	4	0	4	2	1	0

Feelings about remaining in present job

I am very likely to leave in 6 months	0	0	0	0	0	0
I am very likely to leave within the next year	1	0	0	0	1	0
Consider leaving in next year with better offer	0	0	0	0	1	0
Consider leaving in next 2 years with better offer	3	2	1	0	0	0
Unlikely to leave in next 2 years	0	0	1	1	2	0
Unlikely to leave in next 5 years	2	1	2	1	0	2
I am planning to remain until retirement	2	1	2	1	0	0
Other ("Stay if tenured to do so")	0	0	0	1	0	0

M= Mentored N= Non-Mentored

mentored assistant professors (2) preplanning faculty careers. The non-mentored instructors were evenly divided in their career selection method.

In summary, no significant differences were noted between mentored and non-mentored faculty with regard to retention, gender, rank, tenure, career selection, prospects for future success, job change feelings and feelings about remaining in their present job. The average mentored faculty made $5,556 more than their non-mentored counterpart. This difference was not found to be statistically significant. In addition, gender did not significantly influence retention, salary, tenure, rank, prospects for future success, career planning, feelings about job change or retention in present job. The small sample size may have influenced these results.

Although physical therapy is a female dominated profession, the findings of Goldberg in his report at the 1992 American Physical Therapy Association Conference indicated gender biases. He reported that women physical therapists are earning considerably less and promoted less frequently than their male counterparts. These same findings were not noted in the study of this large southern state. One reason for the difference in this variation of salary results may be the the fact that the questionnaire from the one male administrator in this state was not returned to the researcher. Administrative faculty are

reported to earn the highest salary of physical therapists in academe according to the American Physical Therapy Association. Hence the mean salary of men faculty in this study may appear disproportionately low given the exclusion of the male administrator.

Academic Characteristics

The highest degree earned in each academia rank followed the pattern described below. There were six instructors, two had baccalaureate degrees, the other four had masters degrees. Three assistant professors had masters degrees, while eight had doctoral degrees. There was one full professor, who possessed a doctoral degree. No significant difference was noted between degree status and years in academe or years at "this institution".

There was not any significant difference between the highest degree achieved by faculty and whether they were tenured, non-tenured or on tenure track. Moreover, degree did not vary significantly by gender or rank. As might be expected, the one full professor was tenured; seven of the associate professors were tenured; one associate was on tenure track and three were non-tenured. Of the assistant professors, two were tenured, six were on tenure track and two were non-tenured. All six instructors were non-tenured. Higher ranked faculty were more than twice as likely to have tenure (p .01) (Table 7, Faculty Status, p. 51). In addition, faculty in higher ranks were found to have been

Table 7

Faculty Status

	Higher Ranked Faculty				Lower Ranked Faculty			
	Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Baccalaureate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	33
Masters	0	0	3	27	3	30	4	67
Doctorate	1	100	8	73	7	70	0	0
total	1	100	11	100	10	100	6	100
Tenured	1	100	7	64	2	20	0	0
Tenure Track	0	0	1	9	6	60	0	0
Non-Tenured	0	0	3	27	2	20	6	100
total	1	100	11	100	10	100	6	100
p.01								
Retention in Academe								
1-5	0	0	0	0	8	80	3	50
6-11	1	100	5	45.5	0	0	2	33.4
12-30	0	0	6	54.5	2	20	1	16.6
total	1	100	11	100	10	100	6	100
p.002								
Retention Within "This Institution"								
1-5	0	0	0	0	8	80	5	83
6-11	1	100	8	73	0	0	1	17
12-30	0	0	3	27	2	20	0	0
total	1	100	11	100	10	100	6	100
p.005								

	Years in Academe					
	1-5		6-11		12-30	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-Tenure	5	45.5	3	37.5	3	33.3
Tenure Track	6	54.5	0	0	1	11.1
Tenure	0	0	5	62.5	5	55.6
Column	11		8		9	
Total	39.3		28.6		32.1	
p.0101						

	Years at "This Institution"					
	1-5		6-11		12-30	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-Tenure	4	36.4	4	57.1	0	0
Tenure Track	6	54.5	3	42.9	3	30
Tenure	1	9.1	0	0	7	70
Column	11		7		10	
Total	39.3		25		35.7	
p.0041						

retained for significantly more years in academe (p .002) and significantly more years within "this institution" (p.005). Higher ranked faculty were not making significantly higher salaries than lower ranked faculty.

Tenure was also found to significantly influence faculty retention in academe (p .01) and within "this institution" (p .004). In addition, faculty with more years in academe were also found to have more years within "this institution" (p.008). Tenure status did not significantly influence faculty salary.

In summary, higher ranked faculty were significantly more likely to have tenure and more likely to be retained in academia and within "this institution". Tenure significantly influenced faculty retention in academia and within "this institution. Faculty with more years in academia were also found to have greater retention within "this institution". No significant findings were noted between degree and retention, gender, tenure or rank. Neither rank nor tenure status had any significant association with salary.

Institutional Characteristics

Table 8 (Institutional Characteristics, p. 53) details the information by institution. A two tailed t-test was used to examine salary and institutions. Salary varied significantly by institution (p .0001). The private institution (A) was reported to have the highest mean salary

Table 8

Institutional Characteristics

	A		B		C		D	
Salary Range	40,000->75,000		40,000-50,000		30,000-50,000		35,000-70,000	
Salary $\bar{x}$	55,555		44,500		38,125		50,000	
p.001								
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Mentored	7	78	2	40	5	63	4	62
Non-Mentored	2	22	3	60	3	37	2	33
total	9	100	5	100	8	100	6	100
Degree								
Baccalaureate	1	11	0	0	1	13	0	0
Masters	2	22	3	60	3	37	2	33
Doctorate	6	67	2	40	4	50	4	67
total	9	100	5	100	8	100	6	100
Non-Tenure	7	78	2	40	2	25	0	0
Tenure Track	2	22	2	40	2	25	1	17
Tenure	0	0	1	20	4	50	5	83
total	9	100	5	100	8	100	6	100
$\bar{x}$ years in academe	8.8		6.4		9.6		16.1	
$\bar{x}$ years at "this institution"	4.2		6.4		7.9		15.3	

($55,555), the highest proportion of mentored faculty (7 faculty, 78%) and the highest number of doctorally prepared faculty (6). That two-thirds proportion of doctorally prepared faculty was equal to the highest proportion given at one of the public institutions (D). In spite of these factors, institution A was reported to have the lowest faculty retention within "this institution".

Chi square analysis was used to study tenure by school. A significant difference was found (p. 023). There was a higher number of non-tenured faculty in the private institution (7), as compared with the public institutions (2-2-0). Although two faculty were on the tenure track in the private institution, no respondent from this institution was tenured. This is in striking contrast to institution "D" which had zero non-tenured respondents; one on tenure track and five tenured faculty. Salaries were found to be higher among non-tenured faculty ($50,455), as compared with faculty who were on tenure track or tenured ($45,441). This $5,014 difference was not found to be statistically significant. It appears that the small sample size may have influenced this finding.

The faculty in institution "B" reported the lowest mean number of years in academe (6.4), yet had only the second lowest number of years within "this institution" (6.4). Although institution "A" reported only the second lowest number of years in academe (8.8), they were noted to have

the lowest number of years within "this institution" (4.2). Faculty from institution "D" recorded the highest number of years in academe (16.1) and the highest number of years within "this institution" (15.4), almost double that of any other institution. This institution offered the second highest salary with the highest level of tenured faculty.

In summary, salary and tenure varied significantly by institution. Institution "D" had the highest faculty retention in academia and within "this institution". This institution also had the highest level of tenured faculty as well as the second highest salary.

Faculty Feelings and Job Satisfaction

Table 9 (Faculty Job Satisfaction, p. 56) contains the data on faculty satisfaction. Overall, faculty were quite satisfied. When asked to express their feelings about changing their jobs, only two faculty voiced that they "would accept another job offer in which they could earn a comparable salary"; whereas one faculty "would like to maintain a job in academe in another institution". Eight faculty (29%) stated "I am not eager to change my job, but I would do so if I could get a better job". The majority (61%) of faculty would not change their jobs. Six reported "I cannot think of any jobs for which I would exchange mine". Eleven reported "I would not exchange my job for any other". No significant differences in faculty retention within academe or within "this institution" were

Table 9

Faculty Job Satisfaction

Feelings about job change		n	%
I would quit this job immediately if I could find another job.		0	0
I would accept another job offer in which I could earn a comparable salary.		2	7
I would like to change both my job and my occupation.		0	0
I would like to maintain a job in academe in another institution.		1	4
I'm not eager to change my job, but I would do so if I could get a better job.		8	29
I cannot think of any jobs for which I would exchange mine.		6	21
I would not exchange my job for any other.		11	39
	total	28	100

Feelings about present faculty position			
I am very likely to leave this institution within the next 6 months.		0	0
I am very likely to leave this institution within the next year.		2	7
I would consider leaving this institution within the next year if given a better offer.		1	4
I would consider leaving this institution within the next two years if given a better offer.		6	21
I am unlikely to leave this institution within the next 2 years.		4	14
I am unlikely to leave this institution within the next 5 years.		8	29
I am planning to remain in this institution until retirement.		6	21
Other ("I will stay if I get tenure to do so").		1	4
	total	28	100

noted between faculty when examining feelings about a job change.

Overall, faculty rated their prospects for future success as "very good" to "excellent" (96%). Only one individual rated prospects as "fairly good".

When asked to describe how faculty felt about remaining in their present faculty positions, two reported that they were very likely to leave within the next year. One would consider leaving within the next year, while six might do likewise within the next two years, if given a better offer. This grouping constitutes 32% of the total number of respondents. The remaining 68% reported that they were unlikely to leave. One of the latter revealed, "I will stay here if I get tenure to do so". No significant differences, in faculty retention in academe or within "this institution" were expressed when faculty were asked to describe how they felt about remaining in their present positions. As documented earlier, the faculty's feelings about changing jobs or remaining in their present faculty positions did not vary significantly with mentorship, gender or rank.

In summary, the majority of faculty would not change their jobs. Faculty's feelings about changing jobs or remaining in their present faculty position was not significantly associated with retention, mentorship, gender or rank. All faculty rated their prospects for future success as "very good" to "excellent" except one.

Views on Mentoring Relationships by All Responding Faculty

Faculty was asked to rank a series of sixteen questions dealing with mentor relationships on a scale of 1, strongly agree, to 5, strongly disagree. Chi square analysis was used to study these data. Significant differences were found on the following questions, when mentorship, gender, and rank were analyzed (Table 10, Questions Regarding Mentoring Relationships, p. 59). No significant differences were noted on any question, when years retained were examined.

Faculty who were mentored were significantly more likely to agree with the statement "Faculty pursuing academic careers need to establish a mentoring relationship" (p .036). Women faculty were significantly more likely to agree that "Faculty need mentors at all organizational levels", whereas men were more likely to be neutral. (p .042) Women faculty were more likely to disagree with the statement, "Faculty need more than one mentor to advance in academia" . Men faculty were more inclined to be neutral about this statement (p .027). Instructors and assistant professors were significantly more likely to disagree with the statement, "Faculty only need a mentor in the early career stages." Higher ranked faculty were neutral on this issue (p .042). All ranks of faculty agreed, "Acquiring a mentor does not ensure organizational success". The professor and associate professors significantly strongly agreed, whereas the other faculty merely agreed (p .013).

Table 10

Questions Regarding Mentoring Relationships

Question Number	Factors
27.	Physical therapy faculty need mentors to succeed.
28.	It is easy for physical therapy faculty to acquire a mentor.
29.	It is easy for women physical therapy faculty to acquire a mentor.
30.	Having a mentor can mean the difference between career success and failure.
31.	Acquiring a mentor will help ensure organizational advancement.
32.	Many faculty are willing to be mentors.
33.	Faculty only need a mentor in the early career stages.
34.	It appears to be easier for women to acquire a mentor than for men to acquire a mentor.
35.	Having a mentor is more important for women's career success than for men's career success.
36.	Many faculty succeed without having a mentor.
37.	Faculty's slow advancement into upper level positions can be attributed to a lack of mentors.
38.	Faculty pursuing academic careers need to establish a mentoring relationship.
39.	Having a mentor is more important for men's success than for women's success.
40.	Faculty need mentors at all organizational levels.
41.	Faculty need more than one mentor to advance in academia.
42.	Acquiring a mentor does not ensure organizational success.

Significant differences were noted on the following:

Question 38 by mentorship p. 036
Question 40 by gender p. 042
Question 41 by gender p. 027
Question 33 by rank p. 042
Question 42 by rank p. 013

In summary, mentored faculty agree that "Faculty pursuing academic careers need to establish a mentoring relationship". Women faculty agree that, "Faculty need mentors at all organizational levels", as compared with the neutral responses of men faculty. Women faculty are more likely to disagree with the statement "Faculty need more that one mentor to advance in academia". Men remained neutral on these two statements. Instructors and assistant professors were significantly more likely to disagree with the statement, "Faculty only need a mentor in the early career stages," as compared with the neutral responses of higher ranked faculty.

Views on Mentoring Relationships by Mentored Faculty

General Information

The views on mentoring relationships by mentored faculty will be analyzed using frequency counts and percentages (Table 11, Mentoring Relationships by Gender, p. 61). Statistical analysis is limited, given the small sample size (17). Views on mentoring relationships by mentored faculty will be examined in light of gender.

Although eighteen (64%) of the faculty surveyed stated that they had "been guided by a more experienced, higher ranking individual, who aided with their professional development and career advancement beyond normal supervisory guidance", one mentored faculty did not complete the

Table 11

Mentoring Relationships by Gender

	Women Faculty					Men Faculty				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Number of Mentors	5	2	4	0	1	2	1	2	0	0
Percent by Gender	42	17	33	0	8	40	20	40	0	0

Gender of Mentors	Women Faculty								Men Faculty							
	M-1		M-2		M-3		All		M-1		M-2		M-3		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Women	9	75	5	71	5	100	19	79	5	100	3	100	2	100	10	100
Men	3	25	2	29	0	0	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relationship Emergence During Faculty Career																
During first 5 years	8	67	5	72	1	20	14	56	4	80	2	67	0	0	6	60
During 6-10 years	4	25	0	0	2	40	6	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
During 11-15th year	0	0	1	14	1	20	2	8	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	10
During 16-20th year	0	0	1	14	1	20	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
During 21-25th year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	0	0	1	10
Other_____ (specify)	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	20	0	0	1	50	2	20
Faculty Career Level at Relationship Emergence																
Prior to position	7	58	2	29	0	0	9	38	3	60	2	67	0	0	5	50
Lecturer	1	8	0	0	1	20	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Instructor	2	17	2	29	1	20	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assistant Professor	1	8	3	42	3	60	7	29	2	40	1	33	2	100	5	50
Associate Professor	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mentor Career Level at Relationship Emergence																
Prior to position	2	17	0	0	0	0	2	8	2	40	1	33.3	0	0	3	30
Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Instructor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assistant Professor	5	42	2	29	1	20	8	33	0	0	1	33.3	1	50	2	20
Associate Professor	3	25	4	57	2	40	9	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professor	2	17	1	14	2	40	5	21	3	60	0	0	1	50	4	40
Who initiated the relationship(s).																
Faculty did	1	8	3	42	0	0	4	17	1	25	0	0	1	50	2	25
Mentor did	6	50	2	29	0	0	8	33	2	50	0	0	0	0	2	25
Mutually initiated	5	42	2	29	5	100	12	50	1	25	2	100	1	50	4	50

subsequent questions. Therefore, the sample size for this portion of the questionnaire was further reduced to 17. Interestingly, 67% of all women respondents disclosed being mentored, as compared with 60% of men.

As a whole, seven of these faculty (41%) reported having one mentor; three faculty (18%) had two mentors; six faculty (35%) reported three mentors and one faculty (6%) had 5 mentors. No one reported having more than five mentors. Of the women, five (42%) reported having one mentor; two (17%) reported having two mentors; four women (33%) had three mentors; while one woman (8%) had five mentors. The men were fairly similarly represented with two men (40%) having one mentor; one man (20%) had two mentors; two men (40%) had three mentors. No men faculty had greater than three mentors.

All men (100%) reported being mentored by a man, regardless of the number of mentors listed. Women represented the majority (79%) of all mentor categories for women. For "mentor one", women constituted 75% of the mentors; for "mentor two" women represented 71% of the mentors; for "mentor three" women were 100% of the mentors.

The emergence of the mentor relationship was most likely to take place "During the first five years in the careers" of women (56%) and men (60%) faculty. The emergence of the first (women 67%, men 80%) and second

(women 72%, men 67%) mentor relationship was found predominantly during the first and fifth years. Whereas the third mentor relationship emerged predominantly within six to ten years for women (40%), but for men was evenly divided between eleven to fifteen years (50%) and twenty-seven to twenty-eight years (50%).

Faculty, particularly men, were most likely to have the relationship emerge when they were at the level described as "Prior to their academic position" (women 38%, men 50%), or at "the assistant professor level" (women 29%, men 50%).

The protege's career level for "mentor one" and "two" was reported to be prior to their academic position for the majority of women (58%) and men (60%). In addition, the majority of men (100%) and women (60%) proteges reported to be at the assistant professor level when their third mentor relationship first emerged.

Women (38%) were most likely to have a mentor who was an associate professor as compared with men (44%) who were most likely to have a mentor who was a professor. When examining the career level of mentors at the time the relationship first emerged, differences between men and women were observed. These varied with the number of mentors. In the category of "mentor one", women were frequently found to acquire a mentor at the assistant professor level (42%) where men were more likely to be mentored by a professor (60%). In the "mentor two" category

women typically acquired an associate professor (57%) for their mentor; where men were evenly divided in mentoring from assistant professors (33.3%), administrators (33.3%) and with persons prior to academe (33.3%). The third mentor category found women being mentored predominantly by associate professors (40%), while men were divided between assistant professors (50%) and professors (50%).

When asked if both mentor and protege worked for the same company at the onset of the relationship, the majority of women (67%), but only fifty percent of men said, "Yes". The majority of both men (60%-67%) and women (67%-57%) responded, "Yes" to working for the same company, except for "mentor three". In the latter category, eighty percent of women responded "Yes", as compared with one hundred percent of men who responded no.

The mean age of acquiring a mentor was older for all three categories for women (30.8), as compared with men (25.9). This lower age for men was skewed downward, because one faculty listed his father as his first mentor: thus listing his age at birth. When one year of age was omitted from averaging, a mean of 28.3 years was obtained for men. For "mentor one", women averaged 29.6 years as compared with 22.8 for men. For "mentor two", women averaged 31.4 years as compared with 27 for men and for "mentor three", women average 33 years, as compared with 32 years for men.

The mentor's average age was slightly younger for women (41.2), as compared with men (42.7). This was also true for "mentor one" (women 38.5, men 40) and "mentor two" (women 45, men 53). In the second mentor category, women had older mentors (43), as compared with the men faculty (40).

The mentor relationship was mutually initiated for fifty percent of the women and fifty percent of the men faculty. The mentor usually initiated the relationship for men (50%) and women (50%) for "mentor one". Women (42%) more commonly initiated the relationship with "mentor two", where the relationship was more inclined to be mutually initiated for men (100%) with "mentor two". One hundred percent of women reported that the relationship with "mentor three" was mutually initiated, as compared with men initiating (50%) or men having the third relationship mutually initiated.

In summary, sixty-seven percent of all women respondents and sixty percent of men were mentored. Most faculty (92% of women and 100% of men) had three or fewer mentors. All men revealed being mentored by a man, as compared with seventy-nine percent of women being mentored by women. Generally, the mentor relationship was mutually initiated for fifty percent of the women and fifty percent of the men faculty. The mentor relationship typically emerged during the first five years of the faculty's career. Women usually acquired an associate professor for their

mentor prior to their academic position. Men acquired a professor for their mentor prior to their academic position, or when the protege was at the assistant professor level. Sixty-seven percent of women and fifty percent of men faculty worked for the same company, as the mentor at the onset of the relationship. The mean age of acquiring a mentor was five years older for women, than for men. The mean age of the mentors varied by only one and one half years, with men having slightly older mentors.

Mentor - Protege Characteristics

Eighty-three percent of women and seventy-five percent of men related that there were specific characteristics, that they wanted the mentor(s) to possess. One male faculty member did not respond to this question. Faculty were asked to review a list of eleven mentor characteristics, and indicate which traits they looked for in a mentor. A listing of "other" was added with a request for the respondent to specify their response in this category. One woman and two men did not respond at all to this question. Two women and one man neglected to respond by circling the three most important characteristics. Three faculty (2 women and 1 man) replied to this "other" category. Women and men varied in their selection of these traits. Women selected the following traits the most frequently: the "ability to share knowledge and expertise" (11), "knowledge of individuals in the organization" (8), "respect from

others in the organization" (7). Men, on the other hand, chose the "other" category the most frequently (3). Within this trait category, one man listed each of the following; "honest and integrity", "success in professional development" and "published research and major grant support". Two men selected the following three traits; "ability to share knowledge and expertise, knowledge of the organization, knowledge of individuals in the organization", and "other" category.

The "ability to share knowledge and expertise" was selected most frequently by women (8) as one of the three "most important" traits of a mentor. The category of "other" was selected the most frequently for men (2). Within this trait, one man listed "success in professional development", while the other listed "published research and major grant support". Women (7) described "positive and open mindedness" as second on their list of priorities. The other three men were divided between "ability to share knowledge and expertise, knowledge of the organization, and knowledge of individuals in the organization". "High position in the organization" was not selected at all by women or men.

The traits which faculty felt were important in helping them gain or attract a mentor were similar between women and men. Two women did not respond by circling the "most" important characteristics. The traits preferred the most

frequently by women included "dedication and hard work" (10), "ability to work well with others" (8), "enthusiasm" (8), plus "intelligence" (8). Men chose the following traits the most frequently: "intelligence" (4), "ability to work well with others" (3), and "enthusiasm" (3). When asked to report which of these traits were the "most important", women selected "dedication and hard work" (6), "ability to work well with others" (6) and "intelligence" (4). Men preferred "ability to work well with others" (3), "enthusiasm" (3), and "intelligence" (2).

In summary, the "ability to share knowledge and expertise" was selected most frequently by women (8), as one of the three "most important" traits of a mentor. The category of "other" was favored the most frequently by men (2). Within this trait, one man listed "success in professional development", while another listed "published research and major grant support". The traits that faculty felt were important in helping them gain or attract a mentor were similar between women and men: they selected "dedication and hard work", "ability to work well with others", "enthusiasm" and "intelligence".

Problems and Benefits of the Mentor Relationship

Six women (50%) and two men (40%) did not check any problems with the mentor relationship. The data on "mentor one", "two" and "three" were combined, while frequency counts were taken and presented in Table 12 (Problems,

p. 70). Both women (3) and men (2) had the highest frequency count for the problem "Too closely identified with your mentor." Women enumerated the following the most frequently: "overdependency on your mentor" (2), and "too closely identified with your mentor" (2) for "mentor one"; "organizational conflict" (2) for "mentor two"; and "unrealistic expectations from your mentor" (2) for "mentor three.

One man selected each of the following "too closely identified with your mentor", "other" specifically the "first mentor didn't really mentor me" for "mentor one"; "organizational conflict", "jealousy from peers, spouse etc." and "too closely identified with your mentor" were perceived for "mentor two". No men faculty responded to "mentor three".

In order to examine the benefits from having a mentor, the faculty was asked to what extent they benefited from each of the following areas in the mentoring relationship. Each faculty rated the three mentors on eight characteristics, using a scale from "one" ("to a very little extent") to "five" ("to a very great extent") (Table 13, Functions of the Mentoring Relationships, p. 72). Women (4.58) rated "gaining of support" the highest; while men considered this second highest (3.78). Men scored "gaining of knowledge" the highest (4.45), while women evaluated this second highest (4.54). Women rated "gaining of protection

Table 12

Problems

	Women				Men			
	M-1	M-2	M-3	All	M-1	M-2	M-3	All
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
1 Time/energy constraints placed upon you by your mentor	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
2 Unrealistic expectations from your mentor	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
3 Unfair manipulation from your mentor	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
4 Political problems	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
5 Organizational conflict	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	1
6 Jealousy from peers, spouse, etc.	1	1	0	2	0	1	0	1
7 Overdependency on your mentor	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
8 Too closely identified with your mentor	2	0	1	3	1	1	0	2
9 Issues related to sexuality	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
10 Other_____ (please specify)	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1

M-1 = Mentor one
M-2 = Mentor two
M-3 = Mentor three

lowest (2.5), as compared with men who regarded this higher (3.78). Men, on the other hand, allotted "increased power" lowest (2.67). This was also rated very low for women (2.58). Women (4.29) and men (3.33) varied the most (difference between the means = .99) in their response to "increased self esteem" as an area of benefit. The higher rating of "increased self esteem" reported by women may be an example of the factors described by Surrey (1985) in the "self-in-relation" theory. Whereby an individual's self esteem is enhanced by relational development rather than by separation.

Faculty rated functions performed by a mentor using a five-point likert scale ranging from "never" (1) to "always" (5). The scores of each function for all mentors were averaged. The women and men faculty's responses to these five career functions and four psychosocial functions are presented in Table 14 (Benefits of the Mentoring Relationships, p.72). The career function, "suggested strategies for achieving work objectives, career goals and recognition" was rated the highest for women (3.88) and men (4.44). Women assessed "protected you from damaging contact with senior executives the lowest (2.33). Men also concurred this as low (2.65), but their lowest ranked career function was "nominated you for promotion" (1.67). Women scored this function substantially higher 3.14. The latter

Table 13

Functions of the Mentoring Relationship

1 Never 2 Seldom 3 Sometimes 4 Often 5 Always

	Women $\bar{x}$	Men $\bar{x}$
Served as a role model for you by setting attitude, value and behavior examples.	4.38	3.89
Assigned responsibilities to help develop relationships with key figures in the organization.	3.08	3.56
Suggested strategies for achieving work objectives, career goals and recognition.	3.88	4.44
Enabled enjoyable informal exchanges about work and other outside experiences.	4.33	4.22
Protected you from damaging contact with senior executives.	2.33	2.67
Enabled the exploration of personal concerns.	3.83	3.67
Assigned you challenging work along with training and performance feedback.	3.46	4.22
Nominated you for promotions.	3.14	1.67
Supported and encouraged you through positive interaction.	4.46	4.56

Table 14

Benefits of the Mentoring Relationships

	Women $\bar{x}$	Men $\bar{x}$
Gaining of knowledge	4.54	4.45
Gaining of support	4.58	3.78
Gaining of protection	2.50	3.13
Position advancement	2.96	3.33
Increased prestige	3.24	3.33
Increased Power	2.58	2.67
Increased self esteem	4.29	3.33
Gaining clarity of career goals	3.88	3.56

*These calculations represent the average of responses for all mentors (1,2 and 3)

represents the career function, that varied the most between men and women (mean difference 1.47)

When psychosocial functions were examined, women (4.46) and men (4.56) almost always agreed that their mentor, "Supported and encouraged you through positive interaction." Women (3.83) and men (3.67) also rated the following function the lowest: "Enabled the exploration of personal concerns". Women (4.38) varied the most from men (3.89) in their response to the following psychosocial function: "Served as a role model for you by setting attitude, value and behavior examples" (difference between the means .49).

The majority of women (71%) and men (67%) declared their mentor relationship to be "very valuable". Many of the women (100% and 57%) found the relationship with "mentor one" and "two" to be "very valuable", and the relationship with "mentor three" to be of "some value" (60%). One hundred percent of men found the relationship with mentors "one" and "three" to be "very valuable" and were evenly divided (50%/50%) between "very valuable" and of "some value" for the relationship with "mentor two". The majority of men and women characterized their present feeling toward all of the mentors as being "close/peer-like" or "friendly".

In summary, fifty percent of women and forty percent of men did not report any problems with their mentors. "Too closely identified with your mentor" was ascribed as a problem most frequently for both men and women faculty.

Women rated "Gaining of support", while men rated "Gaining of knowledge" the highest for the benefits examined. Both men and women agreed mentors, "Suggested strategies for achieving work objectives, career goals, and recognition". Women and men varied the most with their responses to nominations for promotion by mentors. Women stated this "sometimes occurred", while men challenged it "almost never occurred". The psychosocial function of support and encouragement through positive interaction was listed the highest for women and men. Women varied the most from men in their response to the following psychosocial function: "Served as a role model for you by setting attitude, value and behavior examples". The majority of women and men contended their mentor relationship was "very valuable".

Relationship Duration

Overall, the majority of men (90%) and women (67%) faculty are no longer involved with their mentors. Fifty-seven percent of women and one hundred percent of men are no longer involved with "mentor one", as compared with seventy-one percent and sixty-seven percent respectively for "mentor two"; as well as eighty percent and one hundred percent respectively for "mentor three".

The duration of the mentor relationship was reported by women to last for more years than that related by men. Fifty percent of women reported the relationship with "mentor one" to last five years or more, with thirty-three

percent lasting over ten years. Sixty percent of men reported that the relationship lasted four years or less, with twenty percent lasting over ten years. The relationship with "mentor two" revealed a greater discrepancy with seventy-one percent of women reporting a mentor relationship duration of five years or more, with forty-three percent lasting over ten years. The men (100%) declared that the second mentor relationship lasted seven years or less. The third mentor relationship was reported to last greater than five years by 60% of the women. Meanwhile, one hundred percent of the men reported the relationship to last four years or less.

When asked who terminated the relationship with any of the three mentors, thirty-three percent of the women replied, the relationship was "not yet terminated", as compared with ten percent for men. Meanwhile, sixty percent of the men and only twenty-nine percent of the women maintained, the relationship was "mutually terminated". Forty-two percent of the women and sixty percent of the men agreed that the first mentor relationship was mutually terminated.

Thirty-three percent of the women stated that the first mentor relationship was not yet terminated, as compared with none for the men. For the second mentor relationship, sixty-seven percent of the women reported a mutually terminated relationship; while forty-two percent of the men

reported terminating the relationship. Twenty-nine percent of the women and thirty three percent of the men considered that this relationship was not yet terminated. Forty percent of the women and fifty percent of the men reported that they terminated the relationship with "mentor three". The other fifty percent of men explained the relationship was mutually terminated. Forty percent of the women stated the relationship was "not yet terminated".

"Job relocation" was listed by women most frequently (41%), as the reason for the end of the relationship. Men were evenly divided between that response (33%) and "position change" (33%). The following are the results for each of the mentor relationships.

The cause for the relationship's end was described by women ("mentor one" 67%, "mentor three" 50%) as being due to "job relocation". Women (50%) concluded, that "Dissatisfaction in relationship resulted in termination" for "mentor two". Men (60%) described a position change as being the primary cause for the end of the relationship with "mentor one". Fifty percent of men announced this as the cause for termination of the relationship with "mentor two" and "three" with the other fifty percent, claiming the "Position change" was the cause.

In summary, the majority of men and women are no longer in the mentor relationship. Women, however, are more likely to continue the mentor relationship for more years than men

faculty. More women reported the relationship was "not yet terminated", as compared with men. Meanwhile, sixty percent of the men and only twenty-nine percent of the women admitted the relationship was "mutually terminated". Women listed "job relocation", while men were evenly divided between this response and "Position change" for reasons for the end of the mentor-protege relationship.

Proteges of the Faculty Surveyed

Eighty-three percent of the women and fifty percent of the men confided as having been a mentor to someone. Women reported having mentored from one to five proteges, as compared with men mentoring from none to two proteges. One protege was reported with the highest frequency (5) for women (42%), as compared with zero (3) for men (60%). One woman and no men mentored a protege of the opposite gender.

In summary, women faculty tended to mentor more proteges than men faculty. In addition, one woman faculty mentored a man; while none of the men faculty surveyed mentored women.

Two pivotal questions were added to this survey.

A. Do you have any advice regarding mentoring relationships for faculty pursuing a career in academe?

B. Do you have any advice regarding mentoring relationships for physical therapists pursuing a career in academe?

The responses are narrated in their entirety to avoid omitting any essential information. The following are the responses to the question "A":

1. They are valuable and should be sought out, developed mutually; they are not easy or assured in many places.
2. Remain open minded, be willing to look for more than one mentor to meet your needs.
3. The mentors should be knowledgeable (trained?) in the function, process and products of mentoring at both the individual and institutional levels.
4. Having a mentor is not as important as technical expertise and the ability to get along in complex organizations. Too many "P.T." (Physical Therapy) faculty blame the lack of a mentor for their limited advancement, when they are not prepared to thrive in academia.
5. Allow time for people to mature, Don't expect too much too soon.
6. Seek them out, they are phenomenally helpful and to be ready to "give back" and take on the role of a mentor as well (sic).
7. There are not many institutions with experienced physical therapy faculty with the time, energy, interest and ability to mentor a junior faculty person. I would seek a mentor <u>outside</u> the P. T. field.
8. No.

The ensuing reactions pertain to question "B":

1. Academic chairs need a strong mentoring relationship this is not in place and is badly needed (sic).
2. Don't be afraid to ask for help.
3. Get involved with a mentor with a proven track record and be prepared to work toward independence.
4. Allow exploration of many facets of Physical Therapy treatment before directing towards one area.
5. Seek them out - they are phenomenally helpful and be ready to "give back" and take on the role of mentor as well.
6. It's probably more important to understand the politics of success in academia rather than seek one mentor. Collaboration appears to be very important, many women don't understand this.
7. No.

Analysis of the Interviews

Phase two of this study involved an interview of two faculty from each of the four academic programs in a large southern state. These faculty were randomly selected from the signed consent forms returned by the faculty. The codes were matched to the telephone number of that individual and the interview was conducted over the telephone, tape recorded and transcribed. The telephone interview included the following four open ended questions:

1. What attracted you to this position?

2. What support system have you encountered in this position?

3. What would you like that was not there? (i.e. support)

4. Is there anything else you would like to add?

This researcher was able to get two faculty from each of the four accredited institutions in Florida to consent to the interview. Subject confidentiality was maintained throughout. There were several times when questions of clarification were posed to the researcher. These questions and their responses are included in the transcripts and their analyses.

Given the small number of faculty interviewed the statistics are limited to numbers and percentages, since these were influenced by the small sample size. The interviews do, however, support some of the findings of the questionnaire results. In addition, the responses given in the interviews present information that was not examined in the questionnaire. This information could prove beneficial in faculty retention.

First, this researcher will present the overall picture of the interviewed faculty and compare this with some of the data reported on the questionnaires. Next, researcher will present the summary of the responses for each of the four open ended questions. Finally, following this analysis of

the interviews, the researcher included a complete transcript of the interviews in APPENDIX G.

Of the eight faculty who were interviewed, five (62%) were men and three (38%) were women. Unfortunately, this is not representative of the sample surveyed, which is sixty-four percent women and thirty-six percent men faculty. The years in a faculty position ranged from less than one to sixteen, with a mean of 6. The years at "this institution" ranged from 2 to 8, with a mean of 5 years. The majority (75%) were mentored. The mean years for mentored interviewees in an academic position was 6.2 years, and 5.3 years at "this institution", as compared with 4.5 years for each category in the non-mentored faculty.

Three faculty were non-tenured, three were on tenure track and two were tenured. Tenured faculty demonstrated the highest mean number of years in academia (7.5) and at "this institution" (7.5). Non-tenured faculty had a mean of 6.7 years in academe and 5 years within "this institution". Tenure track faculty demonstrated the lowest retention with a mean of 3.7 years in academe and 3.7 years within "this institution".

For the purposes of this research mean salaries were calculated as previously described for the questionnaire. The salaries of these faculty "at the university" ranged from $35,001 to $75,000, with a mean of $48,125. The salaries earned outside this faculty position ranged from

zero to greater than $75,000. Only one individual did not work outside their faculty position. Calculation of the mean salary, ($24,286) earned outside the faculty position, was based on the seven "outside" salaries reported.

All of the interviewed faculty seemed fairly satisfied in their descriptions, of their feelings about their jobs. However, the majority (62.5%) would change jobs, if offered a better job. Five faculty (62.5%) stated, "I am not eager to change my job, but I would do so if I could get a better job. Two faculty (25%) declared, "I cannot think of any jobs for which I would exchange mine; while one faculty (12.5%) announced, "I would not exchange my job for any other". The individual who was the most satisfied was mentored, in a non-tenured position, with the highest salary in and out of a faculty position. This individual also had the greatest number of years in academe and likewise tied for the greatest number of years within "this institution".

When asked how faculty felt about remaining in their present faculty position one (12.5%) replied in the "other" category stating, "I will stay here if I get tenure to do so". Another (12.5%) responded, "I would consider leaving this institution within the next year, if given a better offer." This individual was mentored and non-tenured, with less than the mean number of years in academe or within "this institution". This faculty member, also, was tied with one other interviewed faculty member for the lowest

salary. Surprisingly, this faculty did not mention salary at all during the interview. The other faculty, with a similar salary range, did infer in the interview that low salaries were a problem. Three faculty (37.5%) conceded, "I would consider leaving this institution within the next two years if given a better offer". Two faculty (25%) stated, "I am unlikely to leave this institution within the next two years". One faculty (12.5%) voiced, "I am unlikely to leave this institution within the next five years." This latter individual is the same one who demonstrated the highest degree of satisfaction in the question above.

In summary, fifty percent of faculty interviewed would consider leaving "this institution" within the next two years, if given a better offer. Almost 38% are unlikely to leave within the next five years or less. One faculty will stay, if tenure is granted.

The following is an analysis of the responses to to each of the four open-ended questions. A synopsis of the total responses given during the interview follows.

Question 1: What attracted you to this position?

Five of the faculty, who were interviewed, cited "teaching" in one way or another: "...light teaching load", "...I was always involved in teaching in one capacity or another. So when the opening was there I tried to do it full-time"; "still being able to continue clinical practice and teach... a variable kind of,...job."; "...the area they

needed teaching in was exactly the area that I had an interest in teaching."

The next most common responses to this question were "faculty", "location" or recent "move", and the ability to "do something different". Each of these was noted in two of the respondents' interviews. Besides, there was one reference to each of the following as attracting features: "responsibilities", "wife's employment", "high salary", "the ability to start a research program", "a variable type of job" (teaching, clinical education coordinating, and clinical).

Question 2: What support system have you encountered in this position?

All of the eight faculty who were interviewed enumerated other "faculty", as a major support system within their response to this question. The next most frequently described support system (3) involved availability and support from the "Director/Chair". Three faculty responses included financial support. Two faculty listed "individual freedom", as being important when replying to this question. This ranged from "monetary support" to financing "research". In addition the following were listed once in the responses to the same question; "faculty materials", "light teaching load", "availability of the dean", "ancillary support", "flexibility", "initiatives outside the department", and "finding people with similar mind-set".

One faculty member was assigned a mentor, within that physical therapy program, upon entering the institution. One faculty inferred that a friend had joined the same institution; but within another department, soon after she/he arrived. This was perceived as being "very beneficial".

Question 3: What would you like that was not there? (i.e. support)

Two faculty stated they would like competent secretaries. One asserted, "A lot of the things I spend my time on, could have been done by a secretary, if I had a good secretary", There was one description of each of the following during the interviews; "completed lab (for research) and monetary support...salary increases would be the most critical type of real support that I could use." One faculty member described a need for some orientation, particularly to the rank and tenure requirements. "...I would have liked a little bit better understanding...I had never had a faculty position before and...didn't have any sense for the urgency of establishing a...track record in publications..and this time lag...The other expectations of being a faculty member including serving on committees and curriculum issues...how to set priorities a little better particularly in regard to the tenure process". One individual advocated "just more availability for support. Seems like people are always so busy that you don't have

enough time to be able to sit and really, you know, get support at some critical times when you really need it." Two faculty were content with what was in place at their institution.

One faculty stated "the resources in the department are considerably greater than what I've experienced before, so I'm not really wanting right now.". The other faculty's response was, "I'm sure there's things that would have been helpful but they've provided everything that you really could need."

Question 4: Is there anything else you would like to add?

The responses to this question were varied and more lengthy than the overall responses to any of the other questions. Two faculty agreed that low salaries were a problem. The following are some of their descriptions: "Certainly a position at the university does not keep up with what therapists can make 'outside'...I think it's extremely important that faculty will be allowed to practice 'outside' both to keep their skill and to supplement their salary...when your graduates are making the same as you or more than you, after 20 years of experience, at a certain point you stop and look at it. So I think the salaries are extremely non-competitive....I think for me, that if I left teaching, it would have been because of finances." I then asked the subject "What is it that is making you stay..?" The response was, "I like teaching more than, I'm still doing

clinical work,...it did not come to that extreme yet....but there is a limit, how much you can sacrifice on the economic front.". Another faculty declared, "Within our own university, one of the reasons a lot of people have been leaving, is the inability to earn outside income. Despite the fact that salaries have been frozen for two years due to state budget problems, there's been a reluctance on the part of administration to allow us to work in clinical settings to earn money. So...kids are graduating...making about the same thing that faculty with doctoral degrees are making.... Satisfaction is one thing, but it doesn't pay the mortgage at all".

Two faculty described the need for an orientation in the following comments; "I have moved into a medical school and the expectations of faculty ...are very different... orientation along those lines, would be helpful...there's many different types of appointments in medical school, research, teaching, clinical, as opposed to the ...regular academics, tenure, non-tenure track." "Some clearing house, if you will, where one could find out about the research in the university, has to offer, fairly rapidly, instead of by trial and error...particularly, because physical therapists typically come to teaching from clinical settings; whereas virtually everyone else, on the faculty of the college here, comes in from post-doctoral fellowships and academic careers and so they kind of have a big edge on physical therapy

faculty...". One of these faculty also expressed the need for "some form of formal support system for entering faculty...some sort of semi-formal or informal 'buddying' system."

One faculty referred to the need for a secretary. Another faculty reiterated, "I wish there were a better system within the university for rewarding the activities, that I think are very important such as: teaching advising, student related activities, interdisciplinary activities, ...To my mind the drawback to being a major research university 'is' that the focus on research is tending to decrease the importance of student related activities." This individual continued, "I find teaching to be extremely exciting, and the university environment to be very stimulating, and think it's just a lot of fun. I enjoy it very much and I hope I get tenure, so I can stay here.".

This was not the only faculty to express contentment in their faculty position. One faculty described "great communication...everyone gets along very, very, well from the dean all the way down....I feel like I'm part of the ball game...everyone gets involved; [It] is very congenial; very good open communication". Another faculty resounded, "... I'm really very happy.". Still another faculty emphasized the students as being very important; "...we have the best and brightest of students and they're just

wonderful to interact with and I have found that the students have..assumed the role, that I thought I would never be able to give up with patients...Faculty have a major opportunity to make a difference in the future of the profession by teaching...and I think that's real important to assume that responsibility.".

One faculty stated that she/he felt the "...questions looked a little biased...It looked like you sort of came up with a hypothesis, that a lot of women aren't possibly doing that well in faculty positions in physical therapy settings; because of a lack of mentorships..." This individual went on to say "...having a mentor ...can be very, very, useful but generally things have to be a 'two way street'...you're generally going to have to be prepared to give something back."

In summary, the most frequent, favorable characteristic mentioned in the interviews was the faculty themselves. The term "faculty" was repeated in a positive way eleven times, while examining all responses by all of the faculty being interviewed. Specifically, faculty conveyed the ..."open communication", ..."good company", ..."get along very, very well", ..."I liked working with them", ..."great communication", ..."very nice", ..."helpful".

Teaching was identified as a positive characteristic, with the second highest frequency (6). Comments included: "...light teaching load, I was always involved in teaching

in one capacity or another. So when the opening was there I tried to do it, ... a variable kind of job, ...I had gotten my PH.D. with the idea of going into teaching, ...I like teaching, ...I find teaching to be extremely exciting".

Overall, there were four citations of research or grant funding and support, as positive characteristics. One faculty cited a draw-back to research "...the draw-back to being in a major research university: that the focus on research is tending to decrease the importance of student related activities." "Good communication and support by the chair/director" were mentioned as positive characteristics by three faculty.

A need for each of the following was expressed three times: salary increases, secretarial support, and orientation. Faculty, who reported a need for salary increases, listed salaries within this institution that ranged from $35,001 to $50,000, with a mean salary of $42,500. Mean salaries were calculated once again, using the mid-point of the range selected by faculty. Salaries outside of the institution ranged from less than $5,000 to $40,000 for these faculty, with a mean of $20,000.

Two faculty stated that high salaries were an attractive characteristic. One of these faculty had a salary range within "this institution" of $70,000-$75,000, while the other's salary was $45,001-$50,000. The mean salary for these faculty was $60,000. The salary range

outside of "this institution" was $20,000 to greater than $75,000 for these faculty, with a mean of $48,750. Hence, faculty who described salary as a problem, had a lower mean salary within "this institution"; as well as outside this institution. This is in direct contrast with faculty, who listed salary as an attractive feature to "this institution", whose mean salary within "this institution" was $17,500 higher than that of faculty who listed low salaries as a problem. In addition, "outside" salaries were $28,750 lower for faculty who stated that low salaries were a problem. Although salary alone was not found to significantly influence faculty retention, it appears that there is a critical level at which physical therapy faculty begin to reconsider options available outside of academe.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to identify the role that a mentor has on faculty retention in physical therapy programs in a large southern state, also to determine if this role varies with gender. In addition, this study examined other factors, which may affect faculty retention.

For the purposes of this study, a mentor is considered to be an experienced person who aids with the professional development and career advancement by providing various career and psychosocial functions, beyond the typical supervisory guidance to a developing individual (protege). (Ricketts 1988).

Career functions previously determined to be the most beneficial include: exposure and visibility, sponsoring, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments. Psychosocial functions include acceptance and confirmation, counseling and friendship, and role modeling (Kram 1985).

This study defined retention as the ability to keep faculty in the same academic physical therapy program in Florida for more than two years. The problem then that this research addressed was that while there are faculty who are retained, the factors influencing this retention were not

substantiated prior to this study. Based on an analysis of research in physical therapy, academia and mentors, reasons for this lack of substantiation appears to be that previous studies have examined mentors in light of promotion, job satisfaction, and career success (Missirian 1980, 1982; Kram 1983, 1985; Ricketts 1988). Further, the studies on physical therapy and academe have primarily focused on attrition "from" and attraction "to" academic settings (APTA 1983, 1985, 1987, 1989). These studies have neglected to examine the role a mentor may play in faculty retention.

The objectives of this study were to examine:

1. Differences in the prevalence of mentoring relationships between faculty who are retained and those who are not retained.

2. The perceived importance of career mentoring relationships as a means of retention.

3. How characteristics of career mentoring relationships differ for female and male faculty as this relates to retention.

4. The differences and similarities between the questionnaire and the interview results.

5. Additional factors which may be influencing faculty retention (i.e. tenure, rank, salary, job satisfaction).

Sixty-four percent of the respondents were women. This percentage is representative of physical therapy faculty

nationally (APTA 1989, 1990). The average, full-time doctorally prepared faculty ranked at the assistant professor level and was not tenured. Although this faculty position was the primary job, it was not the only job held by these faculty.

The average salary was $47,411 within "this institution," plus $16,184 from "outside" sources. The average faculty salary for this large southern state was $1,672 higher than the national average reported by the American Physical Therapy Association for 1991-1992. Faculty preplanned their careers in academe and had a history of a continuous employment pattern. The average faculty was in a faculty position for 10.2 years, and spent eight years within "this institution". Faculty salary, alone, did not significantly influence retention. This is interesting in light of Pearl's (1987) study which reported low salary, as one of key reasons clinicians were not attracted to academia.

No significant differences were noted between mentored and non-mentored faculty with regard to retention, gender, rank, tenure, career selection, prospects for future success, job change feelings and feelings about remaining in their present job. Mentored faculty made $5,556 more than non-mentored faculty. It is believed by this researcher that this 12% difference was not found to be statistically significant due to the small sample size.

In this study the mean salary for women faculty was $1,417 greater than that of the men faculty. The failure of the male administrator to return the questionnaire may have contributed to this discrepancy, as the American Physical Therapy Association has reported that administrative faculty earn the highest mean salaries. Hence, the lack of this data may have negatively skewed the salary of men faculty.

Moreover, gender did not significantly influence retention, salary, tenure, rank, prospects for future success, career planning, feelings about job change or retention in present job. This is in direct contrast to much of the literature, which states that, overall, women tend to earn less, are promoted less frequently and are less satisfied in male dominated professions (Etaugh, 1984; Hennig and Jardim, 1977; Hyer, 1985; Kanter, 1977; National Center for Educational Statistics, 1985; Phillips 1977, Rickets 1988). Goldberg reported at the 1992 National Physical Therapy Conference in Boston, that even the female dominated profession of physical therapy is not immune to these discrepancies. He reported significantly lower salaries, promotions and rank for women physical therapists nationally. The studies conducted by the APTA in the 1980's revealed similar findings. Therefore it may be concluded that the status for faculty, particularly women faculty, is substantially better in this large southern state than for the nation.

Given the data from this study women are earning similar salaries, if not better salaries, than their male counterparts within "this institution." Their salaries outside of "this institution" are however, considerably less, with women earning a mean outside salary of $8,864 as compared with $26,250 for men. This would leave women with a mean combined salary of $56,781 as compared with $72,750 for men. This represents a $15,969 discrepancy between men and women, for mean combined salaries (within "this institution" and "outside" work). The mean "outside" salaries were based on the salaries reported by the respondents. In addition, there were two men and seven women faculty who reported no "outside" income. Fewer women are working outside of "this institution" and those who have outside jobs are earning considerably less than the men faculty. It therefore appears that either women are being paid less on the outside, are working less on the outside or are working at jobs that do not pay monetarily. The research presented by the American Physical Therapy Association (1989, 1990) and Goldberg (1992) has already established that nationally women physical therapists are earning less than men in similar positions. In addition, the previously cited research of Gilligan (1982) and Jordan (1984, 1986) indicates that women are still the primary person responsible for maintaining the household and family. Therefore the women appear to have less time available for

"outside" work given the demands of home and family and the "outside" jobs that they may have access to renumerate women at a lower rate than men.

Higher ranked faculty were significantly more likely to have tenure and more likely to be retained in "academia" and within "this institution." Tenure significantly influenced faculty retention in academia and within "this institution." Faculty, with more years in academia, were also found to have greater retention within "this institution." No significant findings were discovered between degree and retention, gender, tenure or rank. Neither rank nor tenure status had any significant association with salary.

Salary and tenure varied significantly by institution. Institution "D" had the highest faculty retention in academia and within "this institution". This institution also had the highest level of tenured faculty and the second highest salary. This was also the program which was accredited the earliest (1960) within this state. In contrast, institution "A" had the highest salary, the most mentored faculty, the greatest non-tenured faculty and no tenured faculty. It was also tied with institution "D" for the most doctorally prepared faculty and it was the second newest program (accredited in 1982), yet it had the lowest faculty retention within this state.

The benefits of tenure positively influenced faculty retention. Although salary was not a significant finding by

itself, it appears from this data and the interview information that there may be a critical base salary level. If salaries are beneath this level, faculty are less likely to be financially able to remain in academe. This will be addressed further when the interviews are discussed.

The majority of faculty would not change their jobs. Faculty's feelings, about changing jobs or remaining in their present faculty positions, was not significantly associated with retention, mentorship, gender or rank. All faculty rated their prospects for future success as "very good" to "excellent," except one.

Mentored faculty agree, "Faculty pursuing academic careers need to establish a mentoring relationship." Women faculty agree that "Faculty need mentors at all organizational levels," as compared with the neutral responses of men faculty. Women may feel a stronger need for mentors at all organizational levels, because women may be aware of the differences between the women dominated physical therapy programs, and the male dominated university structure. The latter may be more representative of the draw-backs noted in the male dominated professions, described by Yoder (1985), Kram (1985) and others (Etaugh, 1985; Hyer, 1985).

Women faculty are more likely to disagree with the statement, "Faculty need more that one mentor to advance in academia." Men remained neutral on the above statements.

Instructors and assistant professors were significantly more likely to disagree with the statement, "Faculty only need a mentor in the early career stages", as compared with the neutral responses of higher ranked faculty.

Sixty-seven percent of all women respondents and sixty percent of men were mentored. Most faculty (92% of women and 100% of men) had three or fewer mentors. One woman reported having five mentors. All men reported being mentored by a man as compared with seventy-nine percent of women being mentored by women. Of the women who were mentored eighty-three percent reported mentoring proteges as compared with only fifty percent of the men who had been mentored. In addition, one mentored woman reported mentoring a male protege. No men reported mentoring a woman protege. This once again is in contrast to the previously cited literature within the male dominated professions where men have access and acquire more mentors, particularly mentors of the same gender, as compared with women (Kram 1983, 1985 Kram and Isabella, 1985; Phillips-Jones, 1980, 1982; Yoder, 1985).

In general, the mentor relationship was mutually initiated for fifty percent of the women and fifty percent of the men faculty. The mentor relationship typically emerged during the first five years of the faculty's career. Women ordinarily acquired an associate professor for their mentor prior to their academic position. Men acquired a

professor for their mentor prior to their academic position, or when the protege was at the assistant professor level. Sixty-seven percent of women and fifty percent of men faculty worked for the same company as the mentor at the onset of the relationship. The mean age of acquiring a mentor was five years older for women as compared with men. The mean age of the mentors varied by only one and a half years, with men having slightly older mentors. It appears that women are acquiring a mentor later in their career than men but women are also mentoring proteges earlier than men.

The "ability to share knowledge and expertise" was selected most frequently by women (8), as one of the three "most important" traits of a mentor. The category of "other" was selected the most frequently for men (2). Within this trait one man listed, "Success in professional development;" while the other listed, "published research and major grant support." Women appear to be looking more for the sharing of overall knowledge and support, where men appear to be looking more toward a track record in areas that are rated highly, when promotion and tenure are considered. This is reiterated in the interviews. It is also supported by the work in relational development theory (Jordan, 1984; Miller, 1985; Surrey, 1984).

The traits that faculty felt were important in helping them gain or attract a mentor were similar between women and

men: "Dedication and hard work," "Ability to work well with others," "Enthusiasm" and "Intelligence."

Fifty percent of women and forty percent of men did not report any problems with their mentors. This lack of problems is substantially lower than in male dominated professions, where cross gender mentoring is more common (i.e. men mentoring women proteges). The sexuality problems, reported in the literature on male dominated professions, was mentioned only once. This respondent was a woman with a male mentor. (Kram, 1985; Missirian, 1983; Yoder, 1985).

"Too closely identified with your mentor" was listed as a problem most frequently for both men and women faculty. Women rated, "Gaining of support;" while men rated "Gaining of knowledge" the highest for the benefits examined. Both men and women agreed that mentors "Suggested strategies for achieving work objectives, career goals, and recognition." Women and men varied the most with their responses to nominations for promotion by mentors. Women contended this sometimes occurred, while men maintained it almost never occurred. This finding is quite interesting, as it may be the antithesis for the difficulty that women typically have in male dominated professions; thus, placing men at a disadvantage.

The psychosocial function of support and encouragement through positive interaction was registered the highest for

women and men. Women varied the most from men in their response to the following psychosocial function; "Served as a role model for you by setting attitude, value and behavior examples." The majority of women and men found their mentor relationship to be "very valuable." This value was emphasized in the comments on the survey. Except for a few differences, women and men faculty in physical therapy appear to have fairly similar views and values of the mentor relationship.

The majority of men and women are no longer in the mentor relationship. Women, however, are more likely to continue the mentor relationship for more years than men faculty. This is also supported by relational development theory; specifically, the self-in relation-theory (Jordan, 1984; Miller, 1985; Surrey, 1985). More women said the relationship was "not yet terminated" as compared with men. Meanwhile, sixty percent of the men and only twenty-nine percent of the women concurred that the relationship was mutually terminated. Women listed "job relocation," while men were evenly divided between this response and "Position change," as reasons for the end of the mentor-protege relationship.

Women faculty tended to mentor more proteges than men faculty. It is striking that one faculty woman mentored a man, while none of the men faculty surveyed mentored women. This is a very positive finding, in light of previously

published research which stated that women were typically less likely to be mentored and less likely to mentor. The "token" status described by Yoder (1985) does not apply in the physical therapy programs, although it may apply at the university level. Hence, women may have time, or are willing to make time, to mentor proteges. Faculty, who have been mentored, have described this relationship as very valuable in the survey. The comments, on the survey and in the interview, reveal a willingness on the part of faculty to "give back," what they have benefited from, by becoming mentors themselves. This coincides with the latter stages for career development described by Dalton, Thompson, and Price (1977). This continuum was stressed by Reich (1986) to add substantially to the work satisfaction of most employees.

The most frequent, favorable characteristic presented in the interviews was the faculty itself. The term "faculty" was mentioned in a positive way eleven times, when examining all responses by all of the faculty's being interviewed. Specifically, faculty mentioned the "...open communication", ..."good company", ..."get along very, very well", ..."I liked working with them", ..."great communication", ..."very nice", ..."helpful." The previously cited research of Kram and Isabella (1985) explored peer relationships. They found that peer relationships can offer several functions which are similar

to those of the mentor relationship. These include information sharing, career strategizing, job-related feedback, confirmation, emotional support, personal feedback, and friendship. The peer relationship is one of mutuality, as compared with the complementary mentor relationship.

Teaching was specified as a positive characteristic with the second highest frequency (6). Comments included, "...light teaching load, I was always involved in teaching in one capacity or another. So when the opening was there, I tried to do it", ..."a variable kind of job", ..."I had gotten my PH.D. with the idea of going into teaching", ..."I like teaching", ..."I find teaching to extremely exciting". Obviously, faculty selected teaching, because they like to teach.

Essentially, there were four citations of research or grant funding and support as positive characteristics. One faculty cited a hindrance to research "...the draw back to being a major research university; that the focus on research is tending to decrease the importance of student related activities." Good communication and support by the chair/director was mentioned as positive characteristics by three faculty.

A need for each of the following was expressed three times: salary increases, secretarial support, orientation. Faculty, who reported a need for salary increases, cited

salaries within this institution that ranged from $35,001 to $50,000, with a mean salary of $42,500. This represents a salary of $4911, lower than the mean salary of all respondents to the questionnaire. Mean salaries were calculated once again, using the mid-point of the range selected by faculty. Salaries outside of the institution ranged from less than $5000 to $40,000 for these faculty, with a mean of $20,000.

Two faculty stated that high salaries were an attracting characteristic. One of these had a salary range within "this institution" of $70,000-$75,000, while the others were $45,001-$50,000. The mean salary for these faculty was $60,000. This represents a salary $12,589 higher, than the mean salary for all respondents to the questionnaire. The salary range outside of "this institution" was $20,000 to greater than $75,000 for these faculty with a mean of $48,750. Hence, faculty who attributed salary as a problem, had a lower mean salary within "this institution" as well as outside this institution. This is in direct contrast with faculty who listed salary as an attracting feature to "this institution" whose mean salary, within " this institution" and outside this institution, was substantially higher.

Conclusions

Although mentors are considered by physical therapy faculty to be very valuable, mentorships alone do not

significantly affect physical therapy faculty retention. In addition, no significant differences were noted between mentored and non-mentored faculty with regard to retention, gender, rank, tenure, salary, career selection, prospects for future success, job change feelings and feelings about remaining in their present job. Gender did not significantly influence retention, salary, tenure, rank, prospects for future success, career planning, feelings about job change or retention in present job.

Men and women faculty agree on the importance of establishing a mentor relationship. Women feel more strongly than men on the need for mentors at all organizational levels. Women are more inclined to disagree with the need for greater than one mentor to advance in academia.

In this study a slightly higher percentage of women versus men, was mentored. The majority of women and all men had a mentor of the same gender. Unlike male dominated professions, women are finding other women and men mentors. Women also tend to remain in the mentoring relationship for more years than men. Mentored faculty, particularly women, have also taken on the role of mentor thus perpetuating the mentor relationship legacy. Both women and men experienced relatively few problems, as compared with the many benefits of the mentor relationship.

There appear to be a variety of factors influencing faculty retention. The survey revealed rank and tenure to positively influence faculty retention. Within the interviews, faculty most frequently mentioned other "faculty," as a positive feature attracting them "to" and retaining them "within" their institution. "Teaching" and "Research or grant funding" were also frequently mentioned.

Salary, although not a significant finding in the survey, was mentioned several times in the interviews. Faculty who were paid higher salaries found this to be an attraction to academe; lower paid faculty reported low salaries to be a problem. It appears that when salaries reach a critically low level, one lower than or approximating the salary of new graduates, faculty reconsider their options for clinical rather than academic jobs.

Institution "D" had the highest retention. This institution also had the greatest percentage of tenured faculty and the second highest salary level.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. Further analysis of factors which affect faculty retention, such as rank and tenure, need to be explored.

2. Analysis of the peer relationship, as an attracting feature to academe and as a factor in the retention of faculty, requires further study and consideration.

3. The development of an orientation program to physical therapy academe appears to be warranted. Research to examine the effects of an orientation program on faculty retention and satisfaction could prove very useful.

4. This study needs to be duplicated. By increasing the sample size, more vigorous statistical analysis could be used. Logically, its generalizability to other areas of the United States could be increased.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

Dear Colleague:

I am an active member of the APTA and am currently enrolled in the doctoral program at the University of Massachusetts. I am doing the research for my dissertation on factors affecting faculty retention and I need <u>your</u> help.

As you probably realize there is a faculty shortage in physical therapy programs throughout the United States. Factors affecting faculty retention are influencing this shortage. I plan to examine the role these factors play in faculty in physical therapy programs in Florida.

Your response is needed. Given the relatively small number of faculty in the State of Florida, your assistance in responding to the enclosed questionnaire is very important to ensure that the study fairly represents the experiences of all faculty in Florida.

This study is a two part study. You may participate in phase one or both phases of the study. The first part involves a questionnaire, the second part is a very brief follow-up telephone interview. You may withdraw, either partially or fully, from the study at any time.

I know you are busy, but I hope you will take the time to complete this questionnaire by October 15, 1992. To help you enjoy this process, I have enclosed some decaffinated tea. Your assistance in completing this questionnaire
is truly appreciated.

As we all realize, questionnaires do not always ask or describe our most relevant concerns to the topic of the study. In order to address these specific concerns, I would like to conduct a brief follow-up telephone interview to obtain this information from you. If you are willing to participate in this latter, interview phase please sign your name below and return this letter in the separate envelope provided.

Your responses are fully confidential. Responses will only be reported in aggregate statistical form. This report will be publicly available and should be of assistance to the profession in retaining faculty.

Thank you for your assistance in this study. Your time and effort is truly appreciated.

Sincerely,

JoAnne Pelletier Rickert MS, PT
Physical Therapist and Doctoral Candidate
University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

*I,_____, have read the above statement and agree to participate in the study as explained on the attached questionnaire and give my consent following the conditions stated above.

Signature _____ Date_____

APPENDIX B

REMINDER LETTER

Dear Colleague:

Several weeks ago a questionnaire was mailed to you. Perhaps the questionnaire has been misplaced. I am hoping that this is the reason I have yet to receive your response. Enclosed you will find another copy of the questionnaire that was designed to help with an understanding of faculty retention in physical therapy programs in Florida. Your assistance as a successful faculty member is essential for this research. You may withdraw, either partially or fully, from the study at any time.

Please contribute to a better understanding of faculty retention by sharing your perceptions and experiences of factors contributing to retention by completing and returning the questionnaire by October 30, 1992. I am anxiously awaiting your response.

Sincerely,

JoAnne Pelletier MS, PT
Physical Therapist and Doctoral Candidate
University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

I,_____, have read the above statement and agree to participate in the study as explained on the attached questionnaire and give my consent following the conditions stated above.

Signature of participant_____ Date_____

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP POST CARD

Dear Colleague,

About one month ago I wrote to you seeking your opinion about your perception of factors influencing the physical therapy faculty shortage. As of today, I have not received your completed questionnaire.

I am pleading with you to return the questionnaire because of the significance of each response. In order for the results to be truly representative of the opinions of all physical therapy faculty in FLorida, it is vitally important that each therapist in the sample return the questionnaire.

Your contribution to the success of my study is so very important. It will mean the giving of your time so that I can complete several long years of study and perhaps make a significant contribution to the physical therapy profession. Won't you please help? Please return the completed questionnaire not later than November 7, 1992.

Sincerely,

JoAnne Pelletier MS, PT
Physical Therapist and Doctoral Candidate
University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

APPENDIX D
QUESTIONNAIRE

Code Number_____ Would you like an executive summary of the results?___yes ____no

Please answer the following to the best of your ability. Your identity will be kept confidential. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

1. How many years have you been working in a physical therapy faculty position? _____years

2. How many years have you been working for this institution? _____years

3. Which of the following most accurately describes your ranking in the academic setting? (Circle one number)
   1 Lecturer 2 Instructor 3 Assistant Professor 4 Associate Professor 5 Professor

4. Which of the following applies to you? (Circle one number)
   1 Part-time 2 Full-time 3 Chairperson/Director 4 Dean

5. Which applies to you? (Circle one number) 1 Non-tenure 2 Tenure track 3 Tenured

6. Gender? (Circle one number) 1 Female 2 Male

7. Which best describes the method by which you selected a faculty career? (Circle one number)
   1 Preplanned 2 Accidental

8. When did you first decide upon a career in physical therapy academia? (Circle one number)
   1 High school 2 College 3 After entering the labor market 4 Other_____

9. Which of the following patterns best describes your career history? (Circle one number)
   1 Continuous employment pattern (employed continuously throughout adult life)
   2 Interrupted pattern (took time off and then returned to uninterrupted employment)
   3 Sporatic entry and exit history (frequently entered and exited employment in adult life)

10. In what type of institution are you presently employed? 1 Private 2 Public

11. How many times have you been promoted in the last five years?_____

12. Age_____ (Please specify)

13. Is this faculty position your only job? _____yes _____no
14. Is this faculty position your primary job? _____yes _____no
15. If you answered no to number 13 please specify the nature of your other job.
    _____
16. What is your current marital status? (Circle one number)
    1 Single (never married) 2 Married 3 Separated 4 Divorced 5 Widowed

17. Do you have children? _____yes _____no
18. If yes, how many? _____

19. Race/Ethnicity
    1 Black
    2 Hispanic
    3 Caucasian
    4 Asian
    5 Alaskan
    6 Native American Indian
    7 Other_____

20. What is the highest level of education you obtained? (Circle one number)
    1 Some college (specify type)_____
    2 Baccalaureate degree (specify type)_____
    3 Master degree (specify type)_____
    4 Certificate of advanced graduate study (specify type)_____
    5 Doctoral degree (specify type)_____

21. Which of the following best describes your salary in this academic position? (Circle one number)

1	<10,000	8	40,001-45,000
2	10,001-15,000	9	45,001-50,000
3	15,001-20,000	10	50,001-55,000
4	20,001-25,000	11	55,001-60,000
5	25,001-30,000	12	60,001-65,000
6	30,001-35,000	13	65,001-70,000
7	35,001-40,000	14	70,001-75,000
		15	>75,000

22. Which of the following best describes your salary outside of this academic position? (Circle one number)

1	None	10	40,001-45,000
2	<5,000	11	45,001-50,000
3	5,001-10,000	12	50,001-55,000
4	10,001-15,000	13	55,001-60,000
5	15,001-20,000	14	60,001-65,000
6	20,001-25,000	15	65,001-70,000
7	25,001-30,000	16	70,001-75,000
8	30,001-35,000	17	>75,000
9	35,001-40,000		

23. Which of the following best describes how your feel about changing your job? (Circle one number)

1 I would quit this job immediately, if I could find another job.
2 I would accept another job offer in which I could earn a comparable salary.
3 I would like to change both my job and my occupation.
4 I would like to maintain a job in academe in another institution.
5 I am not eager to change my job, but I would do so if I could get a better job.
6 I cannot think of any jobs for which I would exchange mine.
7 I would not exchange my job for any other.

24. Overall, how would you rate your prospects for future success?

1 Poor 2 Fairly poor 3 Fairly good 4 Very good 5 Excellent

25. Have you at any time in your career, been guided by a more experienced, higher ranking individual who aided with your professional development and career advancement beyond normal supervisory guidance? (Circle one number)

1 Yes 2 No

26. Which of the following best describes how you feel about remaining in your present faculty position? (Circle one number)

1 I am very likely to leave this institution within the next six months.
2 I am very likely to leave this institution within the next year.
3 I would consider leaving this institution within the next year if given a better offer.
4 I would consider leaving this institution within the next two years if given a better offer.
5 I am unlikely to leave this institution within the next two years.
6 I am unlikely to leave this institution within the next five years.
7 I am planning to remain in this institution until retirement.
8 Other_____

The following set of statements are designed to obtain information on mentoring relationships. Please respond to the statements using the following scale regardless of whether you have been mentored or not. (Please circle number)

1 Strongly disagree 2 Disagree 3 Neutral 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree

27. Physical therapy faculty need mentors to succeed.	1	2	3	4	5
28. It is easy for physical therapy faculty to acquire a mentor.	1	2	3	4	5
29. It is easy for women physical therapy faculty to acquire a mentor.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Having a mentor can mean the difference between career success and failure.	1	2	3	4	5
31. Acquiring a mentor will help ensure organizational advancement.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Many faculty are willing to be mentors.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Faculty only need a mentor in the early career stages.	1	2	3	4	5
34. It appears to be easier for women to acquire a mentor than for men to acquire a mentor.	1	2	3	4	5

1 Strongly disagree 2 Disagree 3 Neutral 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree

35.	Having a mentor is more important for women's career success than for men's career success.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	Many faculty succeed without having a mentor.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Faculty's slow advancement into upper level positions can be attributed to a lack of mentors.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	Faculty pursuing academic careers need to establish a mentoring relationship.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	Having a mentor is more important for men's success than for women's success.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	Faculty need mentors at all organizational levels.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	Faculty need more than one mentor to advance in academia.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	Acquiring a mentor does not ensure organizational success.	1	2	3	4	5

The final portion of the questionnaire addresses specific aspects of the mentoring relationship and is to be completed by those individuals who have had a mentor(s). Therefore, continue with the questionnaire if you answered "YES" to question number 25. If you have not had a mentor and answered "NO" to question 25, please stop here, include any comments regarding mentoring that you would like to make, and return the questionnaire in the enclosed return envelope. I very much appreciate your completing this questionnaire and wish you continued success in your career.

Sincerely,

JoAnne Pelletier Rickert

Comments regarding mentoring from nonmentored faculty:

Mentoring Relationships of Physical Therapy Faculty

45. How many mentor(s) have you had? _____Mentor(s)

46. Check one of the following to show the sex of the mentor(s). Respond for each mentor you have had. If you had over 3 mentors, respond based on your 3 most influential mentors.

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
1 Male	_____	_____	_____
2 Female	_____	_____	_____

47. Check one of the following to show the time period in your career in which the relationship(s) first emerged. (Please respond for each mentor you have had).

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
1 During first 5 years	_____	_____	_____
2 During 6-10 years	_____	_____	_____
3 During 11-15th year	_____	_____	_____
4 During 16-20th year	_____	_____	_____
5 During 21-25th year	_____	_____	_____
6 Other_____ (specify)	_____	_____	_____

48. Check the one of the following which would best describe your career level at the time the relationship(s) first emerged. (Please respond for each mentor you have had).

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
0 Prior to academic position	_____	_____	_____
1 Lecturer	_____	_____	_____
2 Instructor	_____	_____	_____
3 Assistant Professor	_____	_____	_____
4 Associate Professor	_____	_____	_____
5 Professor	_____	_____	_____

49. Check the one of the following which would best describe the mentor(s) career level at the time the relationship(s) first emerged. (Please respond for each mentor you have had).

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
0 Prior to academic position	_____	_____	_____
1 Lecturer	_____	_____	_____
2 Instructor	_____	_____	_____
3 Assistant Professor	_____	_____	_____
4 Associate Professor	_____	_____	_____
5 Professor	_____	_____	_____

50. Did both of you work for the same company at the onset of the relationship(s)? (Please respond for each mentor you have had).

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
1 Yes	_____	_____	_____
2 No	_____	_____	_____

51. To the best of your knowledge, what were the corresponding ages at the onset of the relationship(s)? (Please write in specific number).

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
1 Your age	_____	_____	_____
2 Mentor's age	_____	_____	_____

52. Check one of the following to show who initiated the relationship(s). (Please respond for each mentor you have had).

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
1 You did	_____	_____	_____
2 Mentor did	_____	_____	_____
3 Mutually initiated	_____	_____	_____

53. Were there specific characteristics you wanted your mentor(s) to possess? (Circle one number) 1 Yes 2 No

54. If yes to the above question, which characteristics did you look for in your mentor(s). Check only those that were important then circle the three most important characteristics.

1 Ability to develop subordinates
2 Ability to take risks
3 Ability to share knowledge and expertise
4 High position in the organization
5 Knowledge of the organization
6 Knowledge of individuals in the organization
7 Knowledge and use of organizational power
8 Positive and open mindedness
9 Respect from others in the organization
10 Rank/Status in the organization
11 Upwardly oriented
12 Other_____

54. Which of the following characteristics, in your opinion, were most important in helping you gain or attract a mentor? Please check those that you believe were important and circle the three most important.

1 Ability to work well with others
2 Assertiveness
3 Dedication and hard work
4 Enthusiasm
5 Independence
6 Intelligence
7 Publicized goals
8 Risk taking abilities
9 The right image
10 Other_____
11 Other_____ (please specify)

56. Check which problems, if any, emerged for you during the mentoring relationship(s). (Please respond for each mentor you have had).

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
1 Time/energy constraints placed upon you by your mentor	_____	_____	_____
2 Unrealistic expectations from your mentor	_____	_____	_____
3 Unfair manipulation from your mentor	_____	_____	_____
4 Political problems	_____	_____	_____
5 Organizational conflict	_____	_____	_____
6 Jealousy from peers, spouse, etc.	_____	_____	_____
7 Overdependency on your mentor	_____	_____	_____
8 Too closely identified with your mentor	_____	_____	_____
9 Issues related to sexuality	_____	_____	_____
10 Other_____ (please specify)	_____	_____	_____

Please comment on the problems.

57. Rate the existence of the following functions in each of your mentoring relationship(s). (Circle one number for each mentor using the following response categories).

1 Never 2 Seldom 3 Sometimes 4 Often 5 Always

		Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
1	Served as a role model for you by setting attitude, value and behavior examples.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2	Assigned responsibilities to help develop relationships with key figures in the organization.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3	Suggested strategies for achieving work objectives, career goals and recognition	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4	Enabled enjoyable informal exchanges about work and other outside experiences.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5	Protected you from damaging contact with senior executives.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6	Enabled the exploration of personal concerns.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7	Assigned you challenging work along with training and performance feedback.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8	Nominated you for promotions.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9	Supported and encouraged you through positive interaction.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

58. To what extent did you benefit from each of the following areas in your mentoring relationship(s). (Circle one number for each mentor using the following categories).

To: 1 a very little extent 2 a little extent 3 some extent 4 a great extent 5 a very great extent

		Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
1	Gaining of knowledge	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2	Gaining of support	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3	Gaining of protection	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4	Position advancement	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5	Increased prestige	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6	Increased Power	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7	Increased self esteem	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8	Gaining clarity of career goals	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

59. Check one of the following to show whether you are still involved in the mentoring relationship with the mentor(s). (Please respond for each mentor you have had).

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
1 Still involved	_____	_____	_____
2 No longer involved	_____	_____	_____

60. Check one of the following to show how long the mentoring relationship(s) have lasted. (Please respond for each mentor you have had).

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
1 Under 2 years	_____	_____	_____
2 Two to 4 years	_____	_____	_____
3 Five to 7 years	_____	_____	_____
4 Eight to 10 years	_____	_____	_____
5 Over 10 years	_____	_____	_____

61. Check one of the following to show who terminated the relationship(s). (Please respond for each mentor you have had).

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
1 I did	_____	_____	_____
2 Mentor did	_____	_____	_____
3 Mutually terminated	_____	_____	_____
4 Not yet terminated	_____	_____	_____

62. For each relationship that is terminated, check one of the following to show what caused the relationship(s) to end. (Please respond for each mentor you have had).

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
1 Needs met/naturally terminated	_____	_____	_____
2 Dissatisfaction in relationship resulted in termination	_____	_____	_____
3 Position change	_____	_____	_____
4 Job relocation	_____	_____	_____
5 Death of mentor	_____	_____	_____
6 Other (specify)_____		_____	_____

63. Check one of the following to show how you would characterize the value of the mentoring relationship(s) to your career. (Please respond for each mentor you have had).

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
1 Very valuable	_____	_____	_____
2 Some value	_____	_____	_____
3 Limited value	_____	_____	_____
4 No value	_____	_____	_____

64. Check one of the following to show how you would characterize your present feelings toward the mentor(s). (Please respond for each mentor you have had).

	Mentor 1	Mentor 2	Mentor 3
1 Close/Peer-like	_____	_____	_____
2 Friendly	_____	_____	_____
3 Neutral	_____	_____	_____
4 Not Friendly	_____	_____	_____
5 Hostile	_____	_____	_____

65. Have you been a mentor to someone? (Circle one number). 1 Yes 2 No

66. If yes, for how many and were they male or female? Number _____Female _____Male

67. Do you have any advice regarding mentoring relationships for faculty pursuing a career in academe?

68. Do you have any advice regarding mentoring relationships for physical therapists pursuing a career in academe?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. THE INFORMATION YOU HAVE PROVIDED WILL BE MOST HELPFUL FOR PHYSICAL THERAPY FACULTY AS THEY PURSUE THEIR CAREER IN ACADEME.

SINCERELY,

JOANNE PELLETIER RICKERT

The above questionnaire was adapted with permission from the instruments utilized in the following research: Ricketts, L (1988) Career Mentoring Relationships of Female Retail Executives in the Southwestern Region of the United States Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, Ohio.

APPENDIX E

OPEN ENDED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Introduction: Hello, this is JoAnne Pelletier Rickert. Thank you for agreeing to participate in the interview on factors which affect faculty retention. Is this a good time for you to answer these 4 questions?

If yes.....continue with interview. Your responses are being recorded, so you may hear a beeping sound occasionally while we are talking. Your name will be kept confidential and your responses will be reported anonymously in the research.

If no..... What would be a better date and time to call?

1. What attracted you to this faculty position?
2. What support system have you encountered in this position?
3. What would you like that was not there? (i.e. support)
4. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Thank you so much for participating in this study, your cooperation and assistance has made this study possible.

APPENDIX F

COPYRIGHT LETTER OF PERMISSION FROM L. A. RICKETTS

TO USE QUESTIONS ADAPTED FROM HER QUESTIONNAIRE

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

College of Family and
Consumer Sciences
Department of Textiles and Clothing
1052 LeBaron Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011-1120 U.S.A.
515 294-2628
FAX 515 294-6364

April 19, 1990

JoAnne Pelletier Rickert
2215 S.E. Eighth
Cape Coral, FL 33990

Dear JoAnne:

I am writing to notify you that you have my permission to use in your dissertation the mentoring instrument I developed.

Best wishes as you begin your study!

Sincerely,

LuAnn Gaskill

LuAnn Gaskill
Assistant Professor
Department of Textiles and Clothing

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT

The following are the responses to the open ended questions posed during telephone interviews with the physical therapy faculty. The questions are listed in the order in which they were asked. For the purpose of clarity, the responses are direct quotes and listed by institution rather than in the order taken during the interview. To maintain anonymity, faculty members are listed as number "1" or "2" and the institutions are listed "A" through "D". To avoid ambiguity, kindly observe interviewer's remarks in parenthesis.

Question 1: "What attracted you to this faculty position?"

A-1 "I had worked with several of the faculty in previous engagements and I liked working with them and when the opportunity came up to join the faculty I took it, so, I guess faculty. All the faculty."

A-2 "High salary, light teaching load and good company."

B-1 "Oh, several things; one, there was an opportunity to do something different than what I had been doing. Another one was the money; it paid more. A third was the chance to start up a research program, which up to that point was not that active."

B-2 "It's hard to tell, I always, I was always involved in teaching in one capacity or another. So, when the opening

was there I tried to do it full-time, but I can't really. For years before I was a like, visiting faculty or part-time teaching a course, while I was holding another position, clinical position or administrative position. So, it just was one more thing to try."

C-1 "I already have some experience in a clinical education oriented position with my previous job, before I came to [institution]; so that attracted me. I was interested in getting into academia and just the flexibility of being at a university, of being able to coordinate; still being able to continue clinical practice and teach and coordinate the internships; a variable kind of, you know, job."

C-2 "Initially, well I heard about from word of mouth and I knew the area they needed teaching in was exactly the area, that I had an interest in teaching; so, that's really what did it."

D-1 "This particular faculty position," ("Yes") "as opposed to any other faculty position;" ("or you could actually explain about other positions and then also explain about this one. Which ever way you prefer)."

"Well I came to "A" faculty position simply because I had gotten my PH.D. with the idea of going into teaching, and I came to this particular position; because my husband's job had moved us to [city], Florida; and this was the nearest physical therapy curriculum at the time. There were

vacancies here and I came down and said, 'Are you interested in me?' And they said 'yes,' and I took the position."

D-2 "It was a number of combination of factors, location, my responsibilities on the faculty, the potential for my wife's employment, and the fact that it was in a well respected, major university with a major health center."

Question: 2. "What support system have you encountered in this position?"

A-1 "Support systems, in regard to what?" ("Physical therapy academe and your position there?") "I'm not sure I understand the question, it's very general." ("OK., The type of support system the research examined happened to be mentorships and did you find this available within your facility and if so, what type and how was that set up, or was it on your own?")

"Well, in faculty here, I am a non-physical therapist and there is one other non-physical therapist on the faculty here and that person has been on the the faculty for several years and he was assigned to me as my mentor, and so in that sense I have that support and as I mentioned in the survey I have only been on the faculty for a couple of months." ("So you have a system that sets up mentors for you?") "Yes, I do and there's regular support for faculty materials and everything else."

A-2 "Good faculty, light teaching load."

B-1 "Tremendous support in terms of time and availability from the dean and director. A lot of individual freedom to pursue what needs to be done. Some monetary support. Money is tight everywhere but considering what is going on in other universities; I tend to think that I get pretty good monetary support as well. Support from staffing and other ancillary type of area as well."

B-2 "In what sense, you mean in the university" ("Yes") "Well there is the other faculty and the chairman of the department, that you can coordinate with or draw on if you need."

C-1 "I have real supportive, the faculty here within our own department is very supportive, especially my department chair, very supportive."

C-2 "Do you have a prompt you want to give to that? I'm not sure what you mean support system. I mean there is no formal support system that I know of." ("Mentors/peer type of support") "Well let's see. "As I recall your question about mentors, actually, none of them are really here. They're people that I had experiences with in other facilities and through other areas. There's not really a formal support system. Everyone here has been very nice to me and has always gone out of their way to give me the freedom and flexibility to do what I wanted to do. But actually the mentors that you asked about are really not here physically."

D-1 "Support systems, well, I guess the fact that several of the faculty have been here for many years has been helpful. On the other hand, there are not many structured support systems here. I have found that I have made some initiatives, including initiatives outside our department; that have been very helpful in finding activities, that I enjoyed working with and that has been as important as anything is finding people with a similar mind set to mine, and being able to work in those kind of activities." ("And what would those activities be?") "Well, I've been involved in the geriatric education center here, which has been a real important link with a lot of different departments here at the university and related to geriatrics. It so happens that I chair the intercollegiate athletics committee here at the university, and that has also gotten me outside the department and linking with other activities. So that part of it is structural things having to do with grants, and part of it has to do with committee structure here at the university."

D-2 "In terms of academic support or in just me professionally or?" ("All of the above.") "Some of the biggest issues have been the division sponsored research, were very helpful to me in getting some seed money to get some of my research started during the first two years, when I was here. Those are competitive programs open to all faculty that are just joining the university. The college

had some, about $25,000 to help me to get started, also buying some research equipment, and shortly after I joined the faculty here I had a friend from graduate school who joined the faculty in another department. Although we work in very similar areas, and having a friend, someone I knew before, coming to the university, coming here and being able to work collaboratively with that individual, has been very, very, beneficial."

Question 3: "What would you like that was not there? (i.e. support)"

A-1 "The department that I'm in right now is considerably, the resources in the department are considerably greater than what I've experienced before, so I'm not really wanting right now."

A-2 "A secretary assigned to me who is competent. ("And how about other types of support, such as mentors and things like that?") "A secretary who is competent assigned to me."

B-1 "What I would like to have is my lab finished, which is dragging and that's a factor of moving into a space; that was previously occupied by somebody else, and not being able to get their things out primarily. We are doing everything we can to do that, but it kind of is at the other end and that's getting a little frustrating." ("What kind of a lab is this for?") "It's a lab for doing primarily bench type research for muscle and muscle physiology."

B-2 "Secretarial work. I would have liked to have had that. Although we supposedly have it, it's really not available. A lot of the things I spend my time on could have been done by a secretary, if I had a good secretary."

C-1 "Oh, that's a good question. I don't know if I have an answer for that off the top of my head. I would say probably, maybe, just more availability for support. Seems like people are always so busy that you don't have enough time to be able to sit and really; you know, get support at some critical times when you really need it."

C-2 "Oh, far and away the most critical aspect of support, without question, is monetary. The salary framework here is such, that someone like myself; who has children in a family needs first thing every year to think about how they're going to supplement their income, and so that goes way above any priorities that are academic, and hence, there's no question in mind that salary increases would be the most critical type of real support that I could use."

D-1 "I guess I would have liked a little bit better understanding. I had never had a faculty position before, and really early on didn't have any sense for the urgency of establishing a, really early on, track record in publications; and this is particularly important as the time lag in presenting manuscripts continues to lengthen and lengthen and lengthen to where by the time you submit; get

it back, do changes, get it back, get it published; is a year or better.

Well I guess I didn't have a sense for that early on, and also just the whole notion of what it's like to be a faculty member. I came in with a very naive sense that because I knew physical therapy, that you just taught physical therapy. The other expectations of being a faculty member including serving on committees and curriculum issues and being involved in advisement all of which I very much enjoy, I think has been much more time consuming than I ever would have anticipated prior to being a faculty member and I think having had some guidance or support in identifying how to set priorities a little better, particularly in regard to the tenure process."

D-2 "I can't really. I'm sure there's things that would have been helpful, but they've provided everything that you really could need. I mean, if you need more that that, you're probably never going to get it done."

Question:4: "Is there anything else you would like to add?"

A-1 "Well, I don't know how germane it is to your research other than in the move I made to join this faculty. I have moved into a medical school and the expectations of faculty in a medical school, at least in my university, are very different in the sense or in comparison to non-medical school faculty positions and that clarification of changes

for people coming from other academic backgrounds outside of medical schools into medical schools, orientation along those lines, would be helpful." ("Specifically?") "Well the way the medical school goes about doing things is different than my previous experience in academia. Fiscally and human resources and management." ("Some differences?") "Well there's many different types of appointments in medical school, research, teaching, clinical, as opposed to the greater, not the greater; regular academics, tenure, non-tenure track. So there's greater variability in terms of the different types of academic appointments for example." ("Do you see that as an asset or a draw back?") "I don't see it as either. "I see it as a point of getting information and that's what your question is and directing it to this."

A-2 "A secretary assigned to me. That's been my only complaint here; I'm really very happy."

B-1 "I think one of the things, that is the great communication that we have here, I mean, everyone gets along very, very, well, from the dean all the way down. I think that's an important factor. I feel like I'm part of the ball game and I'm not back in the, ah, shower or something like that. Everyone gets involved; is very congenial, very good open communication."

B-2 "Faculty retention in our field is the finances. Certainly a position at the university does not keep up with

what therapists can make outside. So, yes, it is your choice to be in the university. However, I think it's extremely important that faculty will be allowed to practice outside both to keep their skills and to supplement their salary. Because at one point, you know, when your new graduates are making the same as you or more than you, after 20 years of experience; at a certain point you stop and look at it. So I think the salaries are extremely non-competitive." ("Anything else?") "No, I think that's it. I think for me that if I left teaching it would have been because of finances." ("So. Maybe, I guess in that light, I should ask what is it that is making you stay, or you know, what is encouraging you to stay?") "I like teaching more than... I'm still doing clinical work. I do have that option to do clinical work, so I don't feel completely cut off from that; and I like teaching enough and it did not come to that extreme yet. You know, I'm still, I think financially, I'm not pushed enough to leave teaching, but if it came to that, I mean, if I left teaching, that would have been the only reason; because I do like to teach, a lot, but there is a limit, how much you can sacrifice on the economic front."

C-1 "I don't think so."

C-2 "Other things, I think some form of formal support system for entering faculty would be a good idea. Some sort of semi-formal or informal buddying system. Some clearing house if you will where one could find out about the

research in the university, has to offer, fairly rapidly, instead of by trial and error. I don't know if that's for physical therapy faculty only, but something the institution could offer. I think particularly it's true; particularly because physical therapists typically come to teaching from clinical settings; whereas, virtually everyone else on the faculty of the college here comes in from post-doctoral fellowships and academic careers and so they kind of have a big edge on physical therapy faculty, per se, in terms of developing a research base or research interests developing course work, and things like that."

D-1 "Oh Dear!" ("That's an open question.") "Tell me again what our topic is?" ("Factors that affect faculty retention and also it can be any factors and one of the factors that I was examining was 'mentorships'. You can either address any factors or that, or what are some of the factors you think may?") "Well, one of the factors, I think, it just has been real important to me, is that we have the best and brightest of students and they're just wonderful to interact with and I have found that the students have sort of assumed the role, that I thought I would never be able to give up with patients, in being able to help; and to be involved in their lives as people and I have found that in my personal instance they have kept me very motivated and interested in moving ahead within this field.

Because, I think the really important thing is here that we, as faculty, have a major opportunity to make a difference in the future of the profession by teaching students what's of value here not only in terms of classroom learning; but in assuming a professional role and taking some leadership and those kinds of things. I think, as I said , I think we're in a unique position to influence that and I think that's real important that we assume that responsibility.

I wish there were a better system within the university for rewarding the activities, that I think are very important, such as: teaching, advising, student related activities, interdisciplinary activities; since most of the reward systems come through a department structure a lot of activities that focus outside this department are not clearly recognized or documented; as those that are done with in the department and I think that to my mind the drawback to being a major research university that the focus on research is tending to decrease the importance of student related activities. I guess that would be my most important message." She then asked the interviewer how the research was going then added: "It's a great field to be in. I find teaching to be extremely exciting and the university environment to be very stimulating and think it's just a lot of fun. I enjoy it very much and I hope I get tenure, so I can stay here. How's that?"

D-2 "Well in terms of a profession wide basis or in terms of the university, because we've lost a couple people within the last couple years within our own faculty." ("Yes, if you want to expand on both of those actually.") "I think the APTA is dominated by the clinicians and they really aren't doing much of a job, a very good job, in meeting the needs of academic faculty from a number of standpoints. The scientific quality of the meetings the APTA sponsors aspire to be abysmal. That's why I don't go to them any longer. Within our own university, one of the reasons a lot of people have been leaving is the inability to earn outside income.

Despite the fact that salaries have been frozen for two years due to state budget problems, there's been a reluctance on the part of administration to allow us to work in clinical settings to earn money. So as a result, there are kids, that are graduating within after two years after graduating, that are making about the same thing that faculty with doctoral degrees are making. That's one thing that's not helping faculty to stay around. Satisfaction is one thing, but it doesn't pay the mortgage at all."

In addition to the above question this individual commented that she/he felt the questions were "a little biased". The following are the comments from this individual.

"Thought some of your questions looked a little biased to me. It looked like you sort of came up with a hypothesis that a lot of women aren't possibly doing that well in faculty positions in physical therapy settings because of a lack of mentorships and it's just the way it read to me. That was probably the primary issues that you were interested in and having a mentor and I have had one for a while, can be very, very, useful but generally things have to be a two way street.

Someone's not going to take you under their wing and help you get a bunch of papers published and move forward unless you're helping them. People just don't have the time to do that, and unless someone's prepared to go in and really commit fully to doing it; getting the research out and becoming productive in someone else's lab and learn techniques; so they can go out and be independent, on their own, with these techniques it's not going to happen. There ain't no such thing as a free lunch. An economics professor once told me if you want some thing you're generally going to have to be prepared to give something back. The other problem is a lot of physical therapy faculty graduate with doctorates in education, go into physical therapy faculties and then try to do research in areas in which they're not really trained.

They're competing against people who have degrees in physiology of anatomy or neuro. or something like that, with

post-doctoral research experience and they wonder why they're not competing effectively with these people in physiology departments and so forth and it's just not, they're not even in the same universe in terms of qualifications, academic qualifications and research tools. But other than that, I don't have anything to say."

This concludes the transcript of the interview with each of the participants.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahern, N. C., and Scott, E. L. (1981). Career outcomes in a matched sample of men and women PhDs: an analytical report. Washington, DC: Committee on the Education and Employment of Women in Science and Engineering. Commission on Human Resources. National Research Council: National Academy Press.

Alberg Graham, P. (1973). Status transitions of women students, faculty, and administrators. In A. Rossi and A. Calderwood (Eds.), Academic women on the move. New York: Russel Sage.

American Association of University Professors (1977). Policy documents and reports. Washington, D. C.: American Association of University Professors.

American Association of University Professors (1984). White collar report, "AAUP: collective bargaining congress". Bureau of National Affairs, 56, 697-698.

American Physical Therapy Association (1978-1987). Reports of board of directors to the house of delegates on transition to the post-baccalaureate level (prog. 39-61.). American Physical Therapy Association, Alexandria, VA.

American Physical Therapy Association (1984). Department of Education Report Physical therapy education and societal needs: guidelines for physical therapy education. American Physical Therapy Association, Alexandria, VA.

American Physical Therapy Association (1984). Raising entry level education for physical therapists: a compilation of background information. American Physical Therapy Association, Alexandria, VA.

American Physical Therapy Association (1985). Five-year plan for post-baccalaureate entry level education. Report to the house of delegates (RC 39-85). American Physical Therapy Association, Alexandria, VA.

American Physical Therapy Association (1985). Final report of the task force on faculty shortage in physical therapy education . American Physical Therapy Association, Alexandria, VA.

American Physical Therapy Association (1986). Five-year plan for post-baccalaureate degree entry level education. American Physical Therapy Association House of Delegates Handbook. American Physical Therapy Association, Alexandria, VA.

American Physical Therapy Association. (1987). Graduate programs for physical therapists: master's and doctoral programs department of education. American Physical Therapy Association, Alexandria, VA.

American Physical Therapy Association. (1987). Major areas of study doctoral programs for physical therapists. American Physical Therapy Association, Alexandria, VA.

American Physical Therapy Association. (1989). Report on the faculty shortage in physical therapy education. American Physical Therapy Association, Alexandria, VA.

Astin, H. S., and Bayer, A. E. (1973). Sex discrimination in academe. In Academic women on the move. Rossi, A and Calderwood, A (Ed.) New York: Russel Sage, 1973.

Becker, W.E., and Williams, A.W. (1986). Assessing personnel practices in higher education: a case study in the hiring of females. Economics of Education Review, 5, 265-272.

Burke, R.J. (1984). Mentors in organization. Group and Organization Studies, 9, 353-372.

Bussone, D. E. (1987, February 13). Oral testimony to the American Physical Therapy Association. Atlanta, Ga.

Epstein, C. R. (1970). Woman's place. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Erikson, E. (1950). Childhood and society. New York: W.W. Norton.

Etaugh, C., (1984, Fall). Women faculty and administrators in higher education: changes in their status since 1972. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 48, 21-25.

Goffman, E. (1961). Stigma, notes on the management of spoiled identity. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.

Gonyea, M. A. (1982). The structure and cost of physical therapy education programs. Report submitted to the Department of Education, American Physical Therapy Association. Washington.

Gwyer, J. L. (1984). Attrition from physical therapy clinical practice. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC. In American Physical Therapy Association (1984). Physical therapy education and societal needs: guidelines for physical therapy education. American Physical Therapy Association. Alexandria, VA.

Hennig, M. T., and Jardin, A. (1977). The managerial woman. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

Jordan, J., Surrey, J., and Kaplan, A. (1983). Women and empathy. Work in Progress. Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies. Wellesley College. Wellesley, MA.

Jordan, J.V. (1984). Empathy and self boundaries. Work in Progress. (No.16) Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies Wellesley College. Wellesley, MA.

Jordan, J.V. (1986). The meaning of mutuality. Work in Progress. (No. 23) Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies, Wellesley College. Wellesley, MA.

Kanter, M. R. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. NY: Basic Books.

Kanter, M. R. (1982). Women and the structure of organizations: explanation in theory and behavior in Another voice. C. Gilligan, Cambridge, MA. University Press. (p. 34-69)

Kram, K. K. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. Academy of Management Journal. 26, 4, 608-625.

Kram, K. K., and Isabella, L. A. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: the role of peer relationships in career development Academy of Management Journal. 28, 1 110-132.

Kram, K. K. (1985). Mentoring at work developing relationships in organizational life. Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Levinson, D. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

McCain, N. (1983, November 2). Female faculty members and students at Harvard report sexual harassment. Chronicle of Higher Education. 27, 1.

Miller, J.B. (1985). The development of women's sense of self. Work in Progress. (No. 12) Center for Developmental Services and Studies. Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA.

Miller, J.B. (1986). What do we mean by relationships? Work in Progress. (No. 22) Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies. Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA.

Missirian, A. K. (1980). The process of mentoring in the career development of female managers. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

Missirian, A. K. (1982). The corporate connection: why executive women need mentors to reach the top. NJ: Prentice Hall.

Monahan, B. (1992). Striving for equality in the practice arena American Physical Therapy Association. (Progress Report 21, 2).

Moore, K. M. (1982). What to do until the mentor arrives: professional advancement kit. Position Paper 120 Pennsylvania. Moore, K. M. (1983) What to do till the mentor arrives. Washington, D C: National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors.

Moore, K. (1984). Center for the Study of Higher Education (Report, No. 83, 310).

Myers, R. S. (1987). Graduate programs for the physical therapist: master's and doctoral programs. American Physical Therapy Association. Alexandria, VA.

Naisbitt, J. (1982). Megatrends. New York: Warner Books. National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs. (1981) Title IX: the half-full, half-empty glass. Washington, DC.

National Research Council. (1981). Career outcomes in a matched sample of men and women Ph.D's: an analytical report. Washington, E. C.: National Academy of Sciences.

Navarro, V. (1977). The society-its influence on health care and delivery. In Corey, Epstein, and Saltzman (eds), Medicine in a changing society (2nd. ed.) St. Louis, C.V. Mosby Co.

Pearl, M. (1987). A marketing approach to relieving the physical therapy faculty shortage in higher education, Doctoral Dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Phillips, L. (1977). Mentors and proteges: a study of the career development of women managers and executives in business and industry. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles. CA.

Phillips-Jones, L. (1982). Mentors and proteges. New York: Arbor House.

Reagan, B.B. (1986). Differences in 1982 income of women and men. A Report to the APTA. Alexandria, VA.

Ricketts, L. (1988). Career mentoring relationships of female retail executives in the southwestern region of the United States, Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Roche, G. R. (1979). Much ado about mentors.Harvard Business Review, 57, 14-28.

Schneider, B., and Snyder, R. (1975). Some relationships between job satisfaction and organizational climate. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 318-328.

Southern Association of Allied Health Deans/Academic Health Centers (1986). Faculty Salary Survey.

Surrey, J. L. (1984). Self-in-relation: a theory of women's development. (Work in Progress No. 13) Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies, Wellesley College. Wellesley, MA.

Surrey, J. L. (1985). Self-in-relation: a theory of women's Development. (Work in Progress No. 13) Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies, Wellesley College. Wellesley, MA.

Sutherland, M.B. (1985). The situation of women who teach in universities: contrasts and common ground. Comparative Education. 21, 21-28.

Tammivaara, J., and Yarbrough, P. (1984). In transition: perspectives on physical therapy and competent physical therapists. In APTA (1984) Physical therapy education and societal needs: guidelines for physical therapy education. American Physical Therapy Association, Alexandria, VA.

Tarlov, A. R. (1983). The increasing supply of physicians, the changing structure of the health services system, and the future practice of medicine. Special report, Shattuck lecture. New England Journal of Medicine 308, 1236-1244.

Taub, N. (1985). Dealing with employment discrimination and damaging stereotypes: a legal perspective. Journal of Social Issues. 41, 85-98.

Tavris, C., and Wade, C. (1984). Work and family spheres and roles, San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.

United States Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census. (1986). Statistical abstract of the United States 1986, national data book and guide to sources (106th ed.). (Library of Congress Card no. 4-18089 Dec. 1985). Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington, DC.

Vaudrin, D. M. (1983). Factors contributing to the upward mobility of women managers, and an exploratory study of mentoring and other influential relationships. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Seattle University, Seattle, WA.

Yarbrough, P. (1980). An ethnography of physical therapy practice. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Atlanta, Georgia State University. In APTA (1984) Physical Therapy Education and Societal Needs: Guidelines for Physical Therapy Education. APTA Alexandria, VA.

Yoder, J. D. (1985). An academic woman as a token: a case study. Journal of Social Issues. 41, 61-72.

Yoder, J. D., Adams, J., Grove, S., and Priest, R. (1985). To teach is to learn, overcoming tokenism with mentors. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press. 119-131.

Zey, M.G. (1984). The mentor connection. Homewood, Ill: Dow Jones-Irwin.